DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 163 379 CG 013 153

AUTHOR	Sandler, Bernice; And Others
TITLE	Taking Sexism Out of Education.
REPORT NO	DHEW-OE-77-01017
PUB DATE	78
NOTE	122p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402 (017-080-01794-6)
JOURNAL CIT	American Education; Apr-Jul 1977
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Educational Practice; *Educational Problems; Elementary Secondary Education; Futures (of Society); Guides; Higher Education; *School Role; *Sex Fairness; *Sex Stereotypes; Social Change; State of the Art Reviews; *Student School Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*National Project on Women in Education

ABSTRACT

This collection of articles presents the substance of the work done by the National Project on Women in Education. The Project assessed current practices in sex-role sterotyping throughout the educational process and also brought together experts and practitioners in the field of sex roles with policymakers in an attempt to plan for change. The articles address the problem of sexism in education in the following areas: the impact of Title IX, teacher behavior, curriculum materials, counselor behavior, influence of television, educational administration, teacher education, the world of work, American social attitudes, and changing male roles. Recommendations for alleviating sexism in each area are offered. (HLM)

****
*   Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made   *
*   from the original document.   *
****

ED163379

HEW Publication No. (OE) 77-01017

Taking Sexism Out of Education

THE NATIONAL PROJECT ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
Joseph A. Califano, Jr., *Secretary*
Mary F. Berry, *Assistant Secretary for Education*

CG 013153

The contents of this volume originally appeared in *American Education* magazine (April 1977—July 1977), published by the U.S. Office of Education. Views expressed by authors do not necessarily reflect Office of Education policy.

DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance, or be so treated on the basis of sex under most education programs or activities receiving Federal assistance.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON: 1978

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government
Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402
Stock No. 017-080-01794-6

Elimination of sex discrimination and provision of equal opportunity for all women and men is one of our highest priorities. Because I know that you share this commitment to equality for women in every aspect of American life, I am pleased to send you this copy of *Taking Sexism Out of Education*. This document reprints a series of articles which originally were published in our magazine, *American Education*. The articles are based on reports of the findings and recommendations of the National Project on Women in Education, a study carried out by the Institute for Educational Leadership under contract to the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I hope that this volume will provide valuable resource materials. I would be happy to receive any comments you may have about this publication, as well as suggestions for other efforts we can make to eliminate sex bias and sex discrimination in the programs, policies, and publications of the Education Division.

Mary F. Berry
Assistant Secretary for Education

Much dialogue and paper have been generated about women over the last few years: their status, qualifications, the forces that limit their progress, the changes that must come. It seemed imperative for us to ascertain the basic problems that existed for women in education and suggest effective solutions. A thorough assessment of the situation, however, convinced us that there is no consensus in the field about what the basic issues are, their relative importance, or what immediate and long-range steps should be taken toward finding answers.

It is not just a matter of documenting discrimination, implementing affirmative action, or mandating laws, such as Title IX. Deep-seated, insidious, emotional and attitudinal conflicts are involved—for both women and men. The resolution of these conflicts requires changing fundamental human understandings and relationships—and *that* can be very disturbing.

Much of the blame for prevailing sex biases can be attributed to education and the part it plays in the socialization process. In trying to pinpoint the crucial issues in education, we examined (in the National Project on Women in Education) every aspect from elementary school through higher education. Higher education has been the focal point of more ferment and, therefore, has made some progress. By contrast, elementary and secondary education has yet to adopt a mode of thinking that recognizes the significance of eliminating sex-biased practices and policies.

The primary result of our assessment effort was in learning how much more needs to be learned before lasting solutions to sexism in education can be offered. Sophisticated research to accumulate more baseline data must continue in every area—from how to make women more aware of their capabilities and how to raise the consciousness of educational policymakers to how real partnerships can be formed in marriage and how we all can come to be considered persons first, and women and men, second.

Virginia Y. Trotter
Assistant Secretary for Education
(June 1974 – January 1977)

Reprinted by permission from *COMMENT - On Research About Women* - April 1977

In July of 1975, the Education Division of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the leadership of then Assistant Secretary for Education Virginia Y. Trotter, gave a contract to the Institute for Educational Leadership to undertake a National Project on Women in Education. The project was to assess current practices in sex-role stereotyping throughout the educational process and at the same time to link experts and practitioners in the field of sex roles with policymakers, the objective being to plan for change. The job was seen not as sponsoring new research but as collecting and coordinating the multitude of work already available from various universities, research projects, foundation efforts, curriculum-development efforts, and experimental programs.

Six task forces, each composed of individuals competent in educational research and action projects in the sex-roles area, were joined with policymakers to help define the issues. Each task force conducted briefings and organized itself to work on an issue paper.

One of the significant products that came out of the work of the task forces before the project closed in July of 1976 was a series of issue papers that give a comprehensive picture of the depth and scope of sex-role concerns confronting the education community today. In four consecutive issues beginning in April 1977, *American Education* published a series of articles based on these papers presenting the substance of the work done by the National Project on Women in Education. These articles constitute the contents of this volume.

ALICE G. SARGENT, Ed.D.,
Coordinator,
National Project on Women
in Education
Institute for Educational Leadership

ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR THE NATIONAL PROJECT ON WOMEN IN EDUCATION

Alison Bernstein, Program Officer, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education; Cecilia Preciada de Burciago, Assistant to the President for Chicano Affairs, Stanford; Mariam Chamberlain, Program Officer in Higher Education and Research, The Ford Foundation; Elsie Cross, Educational Consultant, Philadelphia; Joan Duval, Director, Women's Program Staff, Office of Education; Sara Englehardt, Secretary, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Holly Knox, Director, Project on Equal Education Rights; Martha Matthews, Coordinator, Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education; Michele Russell, Educational Consultant, Detroit; Terry Saario, Program Officer in Public Education, The Ford Foundation; Paula Herzmark, Assistant to the Governor of Colorado; Bernice Sandler, Director, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges; Donna Shavlik, Associate Director, Office of Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education; Becky Schergens, Director, PTA; Melinda Sprague, Organization Consultant, Princeton, New Jersey; Emily Taylor, Director, Office of Women in Higher Education, American Council on Education; Susan Uchitelle, Danforth Foundation; Carol Stoel, Program Officer, Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education.

Others making major contributions to the project included Rochelle Beck, Children's Defense Fund; Bella Rosenberg, Harvard Educational Review; Sheila Tobias, Wesleyan University; Colquit Meacham, Amherst College; Florence Howe, SUNY at Old Westbury; Donna Hart, George Washington University; and Francelia Gleaves, Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges.

Contents

1 **TITLE IX: ANTISEXISM'S BIG LEGAL STICK**
In one of its more significant provisions, the Education Amendments of 1972 makes sex discrimination, once a philosophic or moral issue, a legal issue as well
Bernice Sandler

13 **TOWARD A NONSEXIST SCHOOL**
So that all children can fully develop all their abilities in this rapidly changing society, instructional materials, curriculum, and teacher behavior need also be changed
Task Force

22 **WHAT TO DO ABOUT SEX BIAS IN THE CURRICULUM**
More than print and nonprint materials, the curriculum consists of implicit social messages that reflect the values and goals of the culture which education serves
Adeline Naiman

27 **COUNSELING: POTENTIAL SUPERBOMB AGAINST SEXISM**
Already trained and strategically located, counselors could bring about the changes in students, teachers, parents, and other counselors needed to root out sexism
Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

41 **SEXISM'S UNIVERSAL CURRICULUM**
Television's combination of wide appeal and potential for distortion is giving advocates of equality for the sexes concern about its influence in perpetuating sexist notions
Kathleen Bonk and JoAnn Evans Gardner

50 **NO ROOM AT THE TOP?**
The advantages to education and to society that can be expected when women achieve positions of educational leadership in significant numbers are too persuasive to be ignored or delayed
Task Force

64 **TEACHER EDUCATION: A NEW SET OF GOALS**
Because schools and departments of education have given too little heed to faculty development, many teachers of teachers unknowingly perpetuate sex-role stereotyping
Shirley McCune, Martha Matthews, and Janice Earle

69 **WORK, WOMEN, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION**
Although it may lack the theatrics to win headlines, the struggle over equity for women in work is the essence of the feminist movement and an American social revolution
Corinne H. Rieder

80 **ENLARGING THE AMERICAN DREAM**
An emerging sense of heritage is being proudly expressed by minorities who dispute the position that they should conform to a majority model of social behavior and belief
Donna Hart

99 **CHANGING MALE ROLES**
Though social change toward equal opportunity for the sexes requires many individuals to make certain adjustments, it need not follow that woman's gain is man's loss
James Harrison

AMERICAN EDUCATION EDITORIAL STAFF
William A. Horn, editor
Gertrue E. Mitchell
Mark Travaglini
Alyce Jackson
Juanita Jones

TITLE IX: ANTISEXISM'S BIG LEGAL STICK

by Bernice Sandler

Until very recently, sex discrimination in schools was largely unnoticed, unchallenged, and unchecked. All educational institutions could legally discriminate against females as students, staff, and faculty.

The 92d Congress (1971–72), in a little-noticed legislative explosion, articulated a national policy to end sex discrimination on the campus. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was amended to cover employment in *all* educational institutions whether or not they receive Federal moneys. The Equal Pay Act was amended to cover all administrative, executive, and professional employees, including faculty. Titles VII and VIII of the Public Health Service were amended to prohibit sex discrimination in admissions to all federally assisted programs that train health professionals; the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights was given jurisdiction over sex discrimination; and last, but certainly not least, the Congress enacted Title IX of the Education Amendments Act of 1972 to forbid sex discrimination against students and employees in federally assisted education programs.

There was virtually no opposition to the passage of these laws by either the education community or the public at large. Sex discrimination, once only a philosophical or moral issue, is now a legal issue as well.

The key provision in title IX reads: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Dr. Sandler is director of The Association of American Colleges' Project on the Status and Education of Women. Her article is reprinted with the permission of *Trial* Magazine (October 1976), published by the Association of Trial Lawyers of America.

Title IX covers virtually all areas of student life: Admissions, financial aid, health services, sports, testing, differential rules and regulations, and the like. Title IX is patterned after Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibits discrimination in *all* federally assisted programs on the basis of race, color, and national origin. However, Title IX is narrower in that it covers only federally assisted education programs rather than *all* federally assisted programs; on the other hand, Title IX is broader in that it covers both students and employees, whereas Title VI is in most instances restricted to coverage of students.

Both Title VI and Title IX are enforced by the Office of Civil Rights of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Individuals and organizations can challenge any discriminatory policy or practice by writing a letter of complaint to the Secretary of HEW. They may file on their own behalf or on behalf of someone else or a group. Complaints can be filed on a class-action basis, with or without specific aggrieved individuals being named. If discrimination is found, the statute requires that the Government first attempt to resolve the problem through informed conciliation and persuasion.

The legal sanctions for noncompliance are identical for Titles VI and IX: The Government may delay or terminate awards, or debar institutions from eligibility for future awards. Although a formal administrative hearing is required before funds can be cut off or before the institution can be debarred from future aid, no hearing is required for HEW to delay awards. Such delays in awards can occur while HEW informally "negotiates" with an institution to bring about compliance. HEW can also request the Department of Justice to bring suit in the event of noncompliance.

Since Title IX is patterned after Title VI, precedents developed under Title VI are likely to be applied to Title IX. Individuals may have a private right to sue institutions that allegedly discriminate. Therefore, it may be possible for individuals and organizations to bypass HEW and go directly into court, thus avoiding long delays.

Which Institutions Are Covered?

Any educational institution, public or private, which receives Federal moneys by way of a grant, loan, or contract (other than a contract of insurance or guaranty) is required to comply with Title IX. Schools at all levels are covered, preschools to graduate schools alike.

The statute exempts military schools only when the primary purpose is to train individuals for the military services. An institution controlled by religious organizations is exempt only to the extent that the antidiscrimination provisions of Title IX are not consistent with the religious tenets of the organization; thus discrimination on the basis of custom or convenience is prohibited.

Title IX exempts admissions to private undergraduate institutions, preschools, elementary, and secondary schools (other than vocational schools), and single-sex public undergraduate institutions. Although exempt from the admissions requirements of Title IX, these schools are not exempt from the obligation to treat students in a nondiscriminatory manner in all areas other than admissions. Thus a private undergraduate school, by virtue of its admissions exemption, could legally hold down the number of women it allows to attend. However, having admitted students of both sexes (in whatever proportion), it cannot discriminate after admission on the basis of sex.

The statute was amended in 1974 to exempt the membership practices of social fraternities and sororities at the postsecondary level, the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Campfire Girls, YWCA, YMCA, and certain voluntary youth service organizations.

What Constitutes Discrimination?

One of the problems encountered under Title IX and other civil rights laws is the answer to the question What constitutes discrimination? Policies and practices that clearly and specifically apply to one sex are generally easy to assess as discriminatory. Admissions quotas for women, for example, or rules that require dormitory residence for women but not for men, are overtly discriminatory and a violation of Title IX. Other examples of overt discrimination are:

—requiring different courses for males and females;
—allowing boys but not girls to be crossing guards;
—sponsoring a summer science camp for male students only;

—awarding academic credit to males, but not to females, who participate in interscholastic athletics;

—providing an after-school bus for boys who participate in after-school athletics but making girls walk or provide their own transportation;

—prohibiting women from use of athletic facilities or equipment unless a male signs up for them;

—requiring higher grades for admission from women than from men.

While many of these rules and practices are often "explained" on the basis of supposed "differences" between males and females, they are nonetheless discriminatory and violate Title IX.

The indirect forms of discrimination are far harder to identify and correct. Many of the principles developed in the courts under the Constitution and civil rights laws are used as precedents in assessing sex discrimination in education. For example, for some time, the intent to discriminate has been considered largely irrelevant in determining whether a specific policy or practice is discriminatory. In a landmark decision (*Griggs* v. *Duke Power Co.*) the Supreme Court noted that the intent of a policy is not what counts; it is the effect of the policy or practice that is important. Any policy or practice that is fair on its face but has a disproportionate effect on a protected class (that is, women and minorities), and cannot be justified by business necessity, is discriminatory. While the *Griggs* decision occurred in connection with employment discrimination, the same prnciple has been utilized by the courts in other civil rights issues, and is being applied to sex discrimination in education. Indeed, this principle enunciated by Chief Justice Warren Burger, who wrote the opinion for the unanimous court, is likely to be the touchstone in evaluating the more subtle forms of discrimination against women in education.

Thus at the college level, nepotism rules prohibiting the employment of spouses might well be considered a violation to Title IX because women are more likely to be the spouses kept out of work. Similarly, women's groups are claiming that restrictions on part-time attendance or on part-time financial aid might be a violation of Title IX because women are more likely, due to child-rearing responsibilities, to need to attend school on a part-time basis. Although part-time policies are ostensibly neutral, they often have a disproportionate effect on restricting opportunities for women.

Another example of policies which at first glance seem neutral and fair would be that of giving preference in admission to a nonathletic program or activity to persons who have participated in interscholastic or intercollegiate athletics. Such experience is often viewed as evidence of being "well-rounded" or "competitive." However, because athletic opportunities have been severely limited for females at most institutions, participation in athletics as a criterion for admission or finanical aid is heavily biased, even though it seems to be neutral on its face.

The Title IX Regulation

The Title IX regulation, which went into effect on July 21, 1975, details the impact of Title IX on students and employees: Recruiting, admissions, financial aid, differential rules or regulations, housing rules and facilities, physical education and athletics, health care and insurance, student employment opportunities, extracurricular activities, counseling and testing, single-sex courses and programs, graduation requirements, vocational-education programs.

The employment section of the regulation covers all conditions of employment including part-time employment, maternity leave, and fringe benefits. In general, the employment provisions are similar to those of other nondiscrimination laws and regulations. Women's groups are highly critical of the regulation for being too weak. Some education administrators and some representatives of male athletic interests are highly critical of the regulations for being too strong. Others are simply confused.

Some highlights from the regulation follow:

- In general, the regulation does not require or forbid institutions from taking affirmative action when there is a limited participation by one sex without a specific finding of discrimination. Institutions that have previously discriminated are required to take "remedial action" to overcome the effects of past discrimination.

- The regulation required all recipients (including State departments of education that receive Federal aid) to have done a self-evaluation study by July 21, 1976. In thus examining their policies and practices for sex bias, many institutions have discovered numerous examples of inadvertent discrimination.

Institutions must also set up a grievance procedure for student and employee complaints concerning sex discrimination. However, there is no requirement forcing people to use the grievance procedure; persons can file a complaint directly with HEW without using the grievance procedure.

Additionally, institutions must appoint one person to be in charge of Title IX activities. Employees, students, and parents of elementary and secondary students must also be notified that the institution has a nondiscriminatory policy.

- Although some schools are exempt from coverage with regard to admissions, all schools must treat their students without discrimination on the basis of sex. This includes course offerings; extracurricular activities, including student organizations and competitive athletics; all benefits, services, and financial aid; and facilities and housing. In all of these, the institutions cannot provide different aid, benefits, or services, or provide them in a different manner, or have different rules and regulations on the basis of sex. In other words, schools cannot use sex as a category to classify students.

A school that wants to "protect" its students by requiring only women students to sign in and out would have to apply the same rule for both sexes. Girls could not be required to take a course in home economics unless boys were required to take it; nor could girls be excluded from courses in industrial arts. Similarly women college students could not be excluded from a criminology course because it involved working with male prisoners. Title IX does *not* tell an institution *what* it should do, only that whatever the institution does, it does the same for both sexes.

- In general, financial aid, including scholarships, loans, grants-in-aid, work-study programs, and fellowships cannot be restricted to one sex, nor can criteria be different for each sex.

Thus, offering a woman a loan and giving a comparably qualified male a fellowship would be a violation. Denying or limiting financial aid to married women (while not similarly denying such aid to married men), or offering financial aid to married women and married men on a different basis would also be illegal. At some institutions, financial-aid committees have automatically assumed that a married women needs less assistance because her husband will support her, while a married man needs more assistance because he is the "head of the household." While this assumption may be correct in some instances, it is obviously not correct in all instances. Policies such as these which are based on assumptions about women or girls as a group are likely to come under question. Individuals must be considered on the basis of their individual capabilities and qualifications, and not on the basis of characteristics attributed to the group.

Single-sex scholarships that are established by a will, bequest, or trust are nevertheless allowed; however, institutions with such scholarships must follow a complicated pooling procedure to ensure that there is no sex discrimination in awarding financial aid. As a result of that procedure, institutions in some instances may have to provide additional funds to "match" the single-sex restricted awards.

- The regulation prohibits discriminaton in counseling and guidance. If a school finds that a class is disproportionately female (or male) it must make sure that it's not a result of sex bias stemming from counseling or testing. Counselors encouraging girls to take one course (such as home economics) while encouraging boys to take another (such as industrial arts) are in violation of Title IX.

Schools cannot use separate tests or other materials which permit different treatment, unless the different materials cover the same occupation and interest and the use of different materials is shown to be essential to remove sex bias. Thus, using the old forms of the Strong Vocational Interest Blank with its separate blue and pink forms is prohibited, but materials encouraging women to consider engineering would be allowed.

Institutions are required to develop an internal procedure to insure that their materials are not sex biased.

- Institutions cannot treat students differently in terms of actual or potential marital or parental status, nor can they ask marital status for admission purposes. If an institution wants to include all married students it could do so, but it could not exclude only married females while it allowed married males to attend. Again, Title IX doesn't tell what to do, it only says that whatever is done must be fair.

- A school must treat pregnancy-related disabilities in the same way it treats any other temporary disability in medical plans, or benefit policies it offers to students. Pregnancy must be treated as a justification for leave if the student's physician considers it necessary. A student cannot be required to have a physician's note certifying her ability to stay in school unless the institution requires a physician's certification for students with other conditions.

Title IX permits institutions to maintain separate living facilities for each sex, although housing for students of both sexes on the whole must be comparable in quantity, quality, and cost to the student. Housing regulations cannot be different for each sex.

It is illegal therefore to charge both sexes the same housing fee but to provide maid service only to male students, or to provide different security provisions, such as guards or locks, to only one sex.

Title IX does not require integrated locker rooms, bathrooms, or coeducational housing. However, a school could not use lack of facilities or housing as an artificial excuse to exclude or limit participation by women. Some facilities might have to be reallocated, partitions might have to be built, and some facilities might have to be shared on an alternating basis.

What About Single-Sex Organizations and Programs?

With few exceptions, programs operated by institutions cannot provide different benefits or services, or treat students differently on the basis of sex. However, programs aimed at women need not be abolished, although some modifications may be needed.

- Women's Studies Courses: All such courses must be open to both sexes. The courses, when open to both sexes, do not violate Title IX.
- Continuing-Education Programs: Programs and services which are aimed at persons continuing their education must be open to both sexes.
- Programs Aimed at Improving the Status of Women: Remedial programs and services provided by the institution and aimed at special groups (such as older women who have been out of school and out of the work force for a number of years) may continue, provided that men who wish to participate are not excluded.

- Campus Committees on the Status of Women: Such committees do not violate Title IX. However, membership cannot be restricted on the basis of sex. Having a predominantly female committee would also not violate Title IX if the members had been chosen on some basis other than sex (such as their ability to contribute constructively to the committee's activities).

Title IX covers the activities and programs of education institutions which receive Federal funds. Unless it falls under one of the exemptions listed earlier, any organization which receives "significant assistance" from such institutions—even if the program is not operated by them—cannot discriminate on the basis of sex in any way, including membership, programs, services, or benefits. Organizations which operate off campus without significant assistance from institutions (and which do not receive direct Federal funding) are not covered by Title IX.

- Business and Professional Fraternities, Sororities, and Societies: When the organization receives significant assistance from the institution, its membership must be open to both sexes. Similarly, its programs, services, and benefits must be offered without discrimination on the basis of sex.
- Women's Organizations, such as women's honorary societies, Mortar Board, Association of Women Students: When these groups receive significant assistance from the institution, their membership must be open to both sexes. However, the purpose of such groups (for example, to develop leadership in women) does not violate Title IX. Males who subscribe to the general purpose of the organization and wish to join cannot be denied membership because of their sex. (Programs, services, and benefits must also be offered to both sexes.) In practice, few males are likely to join, and those who do are likely to be sympathetic to the aims of the group. The situation is somewhat analogous to that of a campus chapter of NAACP, a group which aims to better the status of blacks, and allows whites to join.
- Women's Centers: Campus women's centers, whether operated by the institution or by students with assistance from the institution, can continue without changing their purpose (to improve the status of women). However, their membership, programs, and services must be open to both sexes. A great many centers already allow men to use their services and to participate in their programs.

246-199 O—78——2

Employment of Students

Employment of students is covered by other legislation as well as by Title IX. Jobs within an institution as well as those handled by a student-placement service cannot be limited to one sex, nor can there be differences in pay or conditions of employment based on sex. Thus, women dormitory managers must be paid the same as men dormitory managers. Women students cannot be excluded from night jobs or grounds-maintenance jobs on the basis of sex.

Athletics and Physical Education

Apart from the pressures of the organized male athletic hierachy that finds it difficult to give a woman a sporting chance, the sports issue is one of the most complex to deal with. More than most areas of our education system, athletics and physical education reflect the essence of our most stereotype cultural norms: Men are "supposed" to be strong and aggressive and women are "supposed" to be weak and passive. Women and girls have generally not been encouraged to participate in physical activities partly because the traits associated with athletic excellence such as achievement, self-confidence, leadership, and strength, are often seen as being in "contradiction" with the expected role females are "supposed" to plav.

Another difficulty in dealing with the sports issue is that the legal precedents are far from clear. In almost all other areas of discrimination, the precedents developing out of race discrimination cases can readily and easily be applied to sex discrimination. Because of the general physical differences between men and women, the principles developed in other discrimination areas do not easily apply to athletic issues, particularly in the area of competitive sports where the issue of single-sex teams and integrated teams is one that is hardly solved by the regulation. "Separate-but-equal," which is a discredited theory in terms of civil rights, may have some limited validity when applied to the athletics issue.

Generally, schools cannot discriminate in interscholastic, intercollegiate, club, or intramural athletics. Schools can offer separate teams for males and females when team selection is based on competitive skill or in contact sports, such as boxing, wrestling, rugby, football, and basketball. In noncontact sports, if a school has only one team and it is single sex, the other

19

sex must be allowed to try out for it if their overall athletic opportunities have been previously limited. In contrast, a single-sex team in contact sports can remain single sex; the school does not have to let persons of the other sex try out. Thus, an all-male football team can remain all male. However, schools in general must provide overall equal opportunities in athletics for both sexes. A school could not, for example, offer only contact sports for men and have no program for women.

Among the factors HEW will assess in determining whether or not equal opportunity in athletics exists are the following:

—whether the selection of sports and levels of competition "effectively accommodate the interests and abilities" of students of both sexes;
—equipment and supplies;
—scheduling of games and practice times;
—travel and per diem allowances;
—provision of locker rooms, space for practice, and other facilities;
—assignment and compensation of coaches;
—opportunity to receive coaching and academic tutoring;
—provision of medical and training facilities and services; and
—publicity.

Equal funding is not required, although HEW "may consider the failure to provide necessary funds" in assessing equal opportunity.

There is a 3-year transition period for high schools and colleges to comply with the physical-education and athletic requirement (July 21, 1978); elementary schools were given a 1-year transition period (July 21, 1976). The transition period is not a grace period or waiting time.

Certainly upgrading women's athletics will cost money. Unless there is an influx of new money from contributions, which is not likely, the money will have to come from somewhere else. One means would be reducing the amount that is currently being spent on men's sports. It is not unusual, for example, for the budget for men's athletics to be 100 or even 1,000 times greater than the budget for women's athletics. Higher education in general is retrenching, and it may well be that male athletic programs may also have to retrench. Male athletic programs, of which nine out of ten run at a deficit, have been highly subsidized at the expense of women's programs.

The sports issue will be an interesting one to watch since it is drawing support not only from women and girls, mothers and daughters, but also from fathers and brothers—all of whom have an interest in seeing that athletic programs do not discriminate against their daughters and sisters.

Women and those allied with them in their battle for equal opportunity have come around to believing that the hand that rocks the cradle can indeed rock the boat. ●

TOWARD A NONSEXIST SCHOOL

Among a good many thoughtful and fair-minded people who have bothered to examine the instructional materials used in elementary schools today, the notion prevails that these materials are pretty sharp etching tools in stereotyping sex roles. Heightening their concern over sexism in the schools is a real bugbear of a statistic: Although instructional materials account for but 1 percent of school budgets, teachers report that 95 percent of their teaching time involves the use of these materials.

The criteria brought to bear in judging materials as sexist are: (1) If they demean females by using patronizing language, (2) if they omit the actions and achievements of women, and (3) if they show females and males only in stereotyped roles with less than the full range of human interests, traits, and capabilities.

The relative omission from textbooks and instructional materials of women in achieving roles and men in nurturing roles and the depiction of women in only the most restricted and dependent situations have been documented at all educational levels. Myra and David Sadker discuss these points at length in their book, *Now Upon a Time: A Contemporary View of Children's Literature.* As grade level increases, texts correspondingly portray a world of greater complexity and sophistication, one in which women and girls emerge less frequently and, by implication, become less significant. Moreover, minority females suffer particular exclusion, for they are pictured only half as many times as are minority males.

A comprehensive study of sexism in children's readers called *Dick and Jane as Victims*, published by Women in Words and

---

The following had key roles in producing the report on which this article is based: Myra Sadker, Associate Professor in Education at American University; Lisa Serbin, Professor of Psychology, State University of New York; Selma Greenberg, Department of Elementary Education, Hofstra University; David Ulrey, Principal of The Children's School, San Diego; and Ian McNett, education writer.

Images, Princeton, New Jersey, showed that in 2,760 stories in 134 books from 15 different national publishers, boys and men outnumbered girls and women in the following ratios:

- —Boy-centered stories to girl-centered stories—5:2
- —Adult male main characters to adult female main characters—3:1
- —Male biographies to female biographies—6:1
- —Male animal stories to female animal stories—2:1
- —Male folk or fantasy stories to female folk or fantasy stories—4:1

When females are presented in children's books, their most prevalent roles are more than likely those of teacher, maid, nurse, fairy godmother, and nun. They are frequently shown as emotionally and psychologically weak, passive, unachieving, unadventurous, and dominated by or subservient to admiring men and boys. Seldom is a woman depicted in any kind of job or profession, and when she is, she is usually referred to as "Miss," a not-too-shy or too-accurate suggestion that the only women in the work force are unmarried.

Nor does the sex bias in school materials tilt only against females. Stereotyping of male characters also denies boys a full range of activities and emotions. Too often the image involves an absurdly rigid code of behavior for boys, demanding that they be consistently intelligent and brave, that they be perennial winners. They are rarely allowed the healthy release of tears, even in situations involving sickness and death. Books stress the unlimited potential of male characters, the message being that boys should aim high—become involved in adventures, aspire to prestigious occupations and to great leadership. They are rarely shown in service functions or in performing household tasks.

If any rule should apply to the acquisition and use of classroom materials, it is that everything in the environment must be appropriate for all children. Materials and activities that cannot be enjoyed freely by all children should be discarded or modified for nonsexist pedagogical use. It is a poor learning environment that teaches children they are in effect denied access to certain materials and activities. The presence of materials not clearly suitable for all children will keep alive and well the questions most youngsters have already learned to ask: Is this for boys? Is this for girls? Is this something I can do without being laughed at or called a sissy? Or a tomboy?

The most specific and potentially far-reaching response to this problem that the last few years have seen lies in the publication of guidelines by various publishing companies to ensure the future development of bias-free texts. The first enunciation of specific criteria for nonsexist materials came in 1972 with Scott Foresman's *Guidelines for Improving the Image of Women in Textbooks*. Since then, other publishing companies have drafted guidelines for eliminating bias in books.

In general, the guidelines urge that females and males should be equitably represented in instructional materials and that each sex should be presented in a manner free of bias and stereotype. Guidelines stress that females and males of all ethnic groups should be accurately portrayed in terms of character, temperament, and traits. They should exhibit a full range of human emotions and behavior and participation in all walks of life and in a wide range of occupational endeavors.

The guidelines further urge that texts presenting a historical perspective should include a fair portion of materials about or by women. Greater emphasis should be placed on social or cultural history where women have made particularly significant contributions, and texts should clearly identify the legal, economic, and social barriers of different places and times and the impact they have had on individual activity and achievement. These guidelines also emphasize the need to reflect the diversity of family life, including single-parent families, working mothers, couples without children, only children, and other patterns that do not replicate the stereotype of the family with two parents and two children, the older child a boy, the younger a girl.

One of the more difficult challenges these guidelines have taken on is to reduce the sexism inherent in the language itself, and they specify the means to avoid such bias. Not only do they call for the elimination of biased statements about females or males, they urge strategies like the following: (1) Using universal rather than masculine terms when referring to all people (substitute humanity, person, people for the generic "man"); (2) avoiding personification of inanimate objects (eliminate the female reference to ships, cars, hurricanes); (3) avoiding the masculine pronoun to cover both sexes by substituting articles for pronouns, using the passive voice, the plural, or specifying he or she, she/he; (5) using neutral rather than masculine occupational terms (firefighter for fireman, police officer for policeman); (6) using parallel terms like women and men, girls and boys rather than men and girls to refer to male and female adults; (7) avoiding modifiers of generic occupational terms (women doctor) or feminine inflections (authoress).

In the same vein teachers' manuals are being commissioned and teachers on their own initiative are developing materials for their necessary learning. Teachers and other school personnel can also develop standards for the evaluation of sex bias in instructional materials. The California State Department of Education has set forth guidelines for eliminating sexism in school materials.

While it is essential that an effort be made to create nonsexist textbooks and materials, the problem of sexism in education extends far beyond learning materials. The teacher's behavior is probably the most critical factor in determining whether what happens in a classroom will encourage the development of flexibility and proper sex attitudes or the retention of old stereotyping practices. The "hidden curriculum" of sexist teacher-pupil interaction has been directly addressed by State University of New York psychologist Lisa Serbin, whose extensive research and videotape records indicate that both male and female preschool and elementary teachers tend to reinforce problem-solving skills in boys and dependency behavior in girls.

In one study carried out in 15 different preschool classrooms, teachers were observed to respond more often to boys' aggressive and disruptive behavior and to use more loud reprimands when scolding boys than girls. These teacher reactions to boys' antisocial behavior coincided with behavior patterns that were found actually to reinforce aggression and disruption.

The teachers were also found to reinforce "proximity-seeking" in little girls. That is to say the girls received more attention from the teacher when they were within arm's reach than when they were farther away. For boys, no such differential attention pattern was observed. Boys working across the table or in another area of the room were as likely to be reinforced by praise or instruction as those working directly under the teacher's nose. This pattern of response in teachers may result in the greater rates of proximity-seeking and the lower rates of exploration on the part of girls that have been widely reported.

Since the teachers were not aware of their different response patterns, it seems highly likely that the boys' behavior, whether social or antisocial, was somehow more conspicuous to the teachers, causing them to notice the boys more and give them more attention and instruction. Alternatively, of course, the teacher's expectations of sex-typed behavior—aggression and exploration by boys, proximity-seeking and inhibition of aggression by girls—may predispose them to notice and respond to behaviors that conform to their expectations. In other words, the teachers are likely to see the patterns they expect to find, and thus are apt inadvertently to reinforce these patterns with high rates of attention. Behaviors that are not expected, like aggression by girls, are less effective in eliciting a reaction, and thus those behaviors gradually decline.

Differential teacher response observed by Professor Serbin and others also occurred in instruction, information, and praise of classroom activities. Most striking was the disproportionate rate of detailed, step-by-step instruction in how to solve a problem or acquire a specific skill, the very instruction aimed at facilitating a child's independence. The rate of this kind of individualized instruction was more than eight times greater for boys than for girls. Instructional interactions with boys tended to be longer and more detailed as well.

Although functional sex bias often exists beneath the level of awareness, teachers can increase their consciousness of how they may affect sexist practices and how their behavior and attitudes may perpetuate sexism. One method enhancing awareness is for teachers themselves to evaluate the degree of sex discrimination and sex-role stereotyping in the school. Each teacher needs to be able to answer certain questions about her or his own behavior in the classroom. These would include questions like Do I treat boys and girls differently? Do I expect different standards of academic performance from boys and girls, and do I award grades according to these expectations? Do I encourage certain kinds of classroom activities for boys and different kinds for girls?

Often it is difficult for people to be objective about their own behavior and attitudes. Teachers may find it useful to study videotapes of their own classroom behavior or have other teachers observe their behavior. The latter exercise would be less threatening if teachers teamed up and evaluated each other.

Planning a Nonsexist Curriculum

Educators Myra and David Sadker define three levels of concern for helping teachers confront and reduce sex stereotyping in the classroom. The first level is *awareness* or, as it is more often called, consciousness-raising about the forms of sexism in the curriculum—textbooks, teacher-pupil and pupil-pupil interaction. The second level is *clarification,* that is, helping students clarify their feelings about sexism and examine their values with regard to it. The third level is *action,* which can include changing some aspects of their own behavior or of their school or home environment.

Developer of a number of consciousness-raising activities is Prof. Selma Greenberg. An example of a consciousness-raising activity would be to ask children to clip from magazines examples of advertisements that place one sex in occupationally stereotyped roles. Then they could be asked to make their own nonsexist advertisements for school activities and events.

Another consciousness-raising activity involves role exchange, using a classic fairy tale or a famous tall tale as the medium. In stories like "Stone Soup," "The Emperor's New Clothes," and "Little Red Riding Hood," role reversal is quite easily brought about. For instance, in the stories mentioned and in practically all fairy tales, boys, on the one hand, learn to extend themselves—to be tall, heroic, masterful. Girls, on the other hand, learn to belittle themselves—to shrink, to be quiet, to be passed as merchandise from one generation to another. If good things happen to girls, it is because they have been favored by a fairy godmother or a handsome prince; girls achieve nothing material for themselves, and through joyful obedience, compliance, and service to others stronger than they and more powerful, they achieve protection and safety.

To set this record straight a teacher often need do nothing more than substitute a woman's name or the name of some girl in the class for that of the story's central male character.

Direct contact with men and women working in nontraditional fields offers a way to expand learners' awareness and to counteract the paralyzing effects of sexist curriculum materials. Although male nurses and female firefighters may be difficult to find, the effort must be made if young people are to believe that they really can be what they want to be.

That the rearing of a family is in reality a work experience should not be overlooked in clarifying a child's feelings about sexism. Family role playing and reverse sex-role playing will afford each class member an opportunity to experience the viewpoint of the opposite sex. Children need to see their own and other children's parents as complex people with varying interests, skills, and abilities. To achieve this, teachers should encourage children to use the people at home as resources for answering questions such as: My father has fun when he __________. My mother has fun when she __________. My brother's favorite TV program is __________. My sister's favorite TV program is __________. In the same vein questions dealing with problems can be developed. In my family __________ does the cooking. Why? In my family __________ takes out the garbage. Why?

Using the completed question forms as guidelines, children may then be asked to move to level three to help bring about change in sexist home or school environments.

Fringe Free Play

Since society wastes little time in exposing children to its sexist notions and practices, it follows that youngsters need to be acquainted as soon as possible with materials that encourage nonsexist attitudes. This means the preschool level and such things as dramatic play, the housekeeping corner, doll play, and self-care, each of which may be structured to chip away at any sexist attitudes that may already have been acquired and to turn aside the acquisition of others.

The housekeeping corner, for example, is a traditional part of mainstream early-childhood environments, but it needs to be treated as a learning center if sexist behaviors are to be altered. Free play is, after all, sexist play. A romantic respect for children's "natural" desires runs through early-childhood education. This attitude gives the so-called "free play" opportunities an almost mystical reverence. There is something paradoxical in this because though most early-childhood teachers have great respect for the influence of environment on development, they have difficulty believing the child's prior learnings have bent free choice to reflect what children believe they should appropriately and properly do. Thus it is possible to honor children's choices that may grow from no more admirable motives than a fear of failure, a nervousness about participating in something new, and a sensitivity to peer disapproval.

Barbara Sprung's book *Non-Sexist Education for Young Children: A Practical Guide* offers many fine suggestions on how teachers can produce the necessarily specific nonsexist materials and indicates what commercial nonsexist material is now available. In the issue of materials, the early-childhood environment may be the most fortunate of all school environments. Teachers of older children, often under pressure to "cover" certain curricular areas, are tempted to retain the use of stereotypic sexist materials. Early-childhood educators can simply discard offensive material, since each is in most cases also the curriculum coordinator.

The Role of Parents

Parents are essential colleagues in carrying out a "de-stereotyping" program, as they are often eager to observe and contribute to the education of their children. By working together, teachers and parents can more effectively present a nonsexist educational experience to students.

In the case of sex-role stereotyping it is important that parents be made to understand the goal of providing increased options and flexibility for their children and the importance of early experiences in later career and social development. Toward this same end, one of the most significant interventions that teachers can make is to encourage cross-sex play. Work of this kind is being carried on at The Children's School in San Diego under its principal, David Ulrey.

The Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education has some suggestions for parents who wish to help de-stereotype their children's education:

- Review the textbooks and materials that your children are using and identify sources of bias where they exist.
- Meet with your children's teachers and principals to learn what they are doing about expanding role options in the classroom.
- Work with other parents or groups to raise their awareness of the problem of biased materials.
- Meet with school board members to make known your concern. Support expenditures for supplementary materials and in-service training for school personnel.

- Help to organize a community workshop that makes available new nonsexist multi-ethnic books.
- Meet with local TV station officials to talk about sex-stereotyped roles.
- Help to launch a study of the bias of textbooks used in your community schools, and publicize the results along with recommendations for change.
- Help establish a special collection of books in the school or public library that features nonracist, nonsexist, and multi-ethnic books.
- Write to or meet with persons responsible for textbook selection at local and state levels to voice your concerns, urging purchase of quality materials and inclusion of supplementary materials.
- Write textbook publishers and indicate dissatisfaction with biased material. Support examples of nonracist, nonsexist books that have been developed.
- Recognize the efforts of teachers and administrators who are taking positive actions to deal with the problem.

American society is changing so rapidly that children need to be educated to develop all their cognitive, social, and physical abilities. Both boys and girls profit from a variety of activities and a broad repertoire of skills. One of the teacher's roles is to encourage this broad participation and to help develop many skills that are free of sex roles. Children who are with a teacher only one year early in their lives will live at least three-quarters of a century after they leave that classroom. The pertinent question is, Will that teacher have done as much as possible toward enabling the children to continue growing and participating through those coming years? ●

WHAT TO DO ABOUT SEX BIAS IN THE CURRICULUM

by Adeline Naiman

There are a number of issues on sexism that schools face, and in so doing they must take into account the guidelines set by their own systems and communities. One such issue arousing controversy is sex-fair versus sex-affirmative teaching materials. In the light of the great inequalities to be overcome, do schools need a more aggressive stance on sex bias in curriculum? Should schools make do with the often sexist materials they own and expect teachers to provide the disclaimers and cautions, or should new materials be prepared or bought? How can schools deal with the impact of television, and what should an individual teacher or school do about biased educational programs beamed into the classroom? Even the most sophisticated and egalitarian curriculum is not "teacher proof"; thus, how can teacher training contribute to a teacher's successful use of nonsexist—or even biased—materials?

A particular question for schools is whether it is better to institute courses in women's studies, particularly on the secondary level and for teachers, or to revamp as extensively as possible the whole curriculum, giving attention to language, role models, stereotypes, and balanced historical and cultural perspectives. Should studying and eliminating sex bias remain the province of a particular component of the school structure or curriculum, or should this effort pervade the entire curriculum (mainstreaming)? Should a women's studies course be an elective, and if so, under which department? Courses on women's issues are currently taught in high-school departments as diverse as media, history, English, home economics, social studies, guidance, and health.

Ms. Naiman is Director of Publications and Assistant to the President, Education Development Center. She is also Director of the Role of Women in American Society Project.

Schools must also recognize pressures from the community, which may challenge Federal legislation on the ground that its beliefs and right of free speech are being threatened. Parental uproar has already been provoked by the Title IX requirements which eliminate sex discrimination in school athletic programs. How does a school or school board handle the diversity of values, the fears, and the expectations of parents? How particularly can schools help students to make their own life choices free from the *a priori* constraints imposed by traditional socialization. Girls "choose" limited options, not realizing that their choices are heavily conditioned by the expectations of others. Where does "curriculum" leave off and society begin?

Perhaps there is a curriculum for the school and the larger society to pursue in combating sex bias. Through the schools, parents, teachers, and administrators can be helped to increase their own awareness of the process and costs of sex bias. Schools can extend participation in curriculum development to the users and provide curriculum materials, training, and support systems to teachers. Colleges and teacher-training institutions have a special responsibility to attend to the preservice curriculum and to offer resources to inservice teachers who seek retraining. There are also 10 general assistance centers around the country to further these efforts, and other projects have been funded under the Women's Educational Equity Act. The higher-education establishment can work with public and private research and development agencies to develop materials, programs, and guidelines for bias-free and sex-affirmative materials. Publishers can be encouraged to go beyond the letter of the law in preparing and revising curricular materials. Guidelines, such as the ones developed by the National Council of Teachers of English ("Guidelines for Nonsexist Use of Language," single copies of which may be had by writing to the Council, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, IL 61801), should be standardized and shared across the educational publishing industry and throughout schools. Ultimately, however, the responsibility for assuring bias-free curriculum belongs to governing bodies: school boards and State boards.

What are the realistic constraints on instituting bias-free curriculums in schools at this time? Parental pressures and the traditional social attitudes as expressed in the all-pervasive media are obvious, albeit hard to track down. Other constraints are easier to pinpoint: Budgets are tight and shrinking. How can schools allocate funds for new curricular materials or teacher training when declining enrollments, tenured faculties, and a depressed economy are squeezing the already strangled dollar? For example, in many systems where school budgets are supported by real-estate taxes, most of the operating costs of Government are assignable to the schools; yet only a small percentage of those costs is subject to debate over use. Teacher contracts, building mortgages, and fixed expenditures can take 85 percent or more of the total school budget. With limited options, how is a school system to set priorities? Title IX calls for an immediate expenditure of already limited funds. Will schools see curricular reform as an equally high priority?

Important, too, is the problem of affecting teachers and others in an area not easily reached by programs or legislation: attitudes. Attitudinal change in any population is hard to achieve and hard to measure. How can regard for the rights of individuals be maintained while carrying out the broader obligation of respect for statutory and moral law?

In the face of this large task, policymakers in education need to set their own priorities for helping the schools. With regard to curricular materials in particular, policymakers should implement selection policies for new materials that will ensure bias-free curriculums. Where complete revision or replacement is not possible, they should provide supplemental materials to balance those currently in use. They should express their concern for consistent observation of bias-free guidelines to the commercial sector and to public and private agencies. They should enlist the support of teachers in using these guidelines in the classroom and in monitoring all acquired materials. Above all, policymakers should support the development of new materials that will meet the present need for addressing sex bias and that, over time and with use, will help to bring about the change in attitudes necessary to guarantee an end to sex bias in schools.

Recommendations

The following are suggestions for actions that can be taken by school boards and administrators:

1. Develop a policy statement outlining your concern about the elimination of racist and sexist stereotypes in textbooks and library books.

2. Appoint a task force to investigate the racist and sexist problems in your community and make recommendations for action.

3. Develop guidelines for all personnel to follow in purchasing and using textbooks and other instructional materials.

4. Earmark a proportion of funds to be used for the purchase of nonracist, nonsexist supplementary materials.

5. Develop and implement a plan for in-service training of all personnel who select, purchase, recommend, or use textbooks and other instructional materials.

6. Direct supervisors and curriculum specialists to develop resources and materials for assisting classroom teachers in reducing the impact of biased materials.

7. Call on State departments of education, teacher-training institutions, and professional associations to provide materials, workshops, and technical assistance.

8. Interpret the problems of biased textbooks and materials to parents, community groups, and policymaking boards. Let them know of your concerns and how they may assist in solving the problem. Hold book fairs that offer nonracist, nonsexist books to parents.

State boards and education departments can be instrumental in implementing the above recommendations. In addition, they can assist local systems by providing centralized resources, both for the State as a whole and for regional centers. The following are some particular supports the State can provide:

1. Compile a reference library of bias-free materials for supervisors and teachers.

2. Provide a centralized lending library of books, periodicals, audiovisual materials (particularly films), curricular materials, documents relating to legislation and guidelines for implementation. (Many of these documents are available from the Office of Education as a result of the Women's Educational Equity Act.)

3. Mandate workshops for teachers and administrators on dealing with sex bias in the curriculum, in existing materials, and in the media. Provide funding for work-

shop leaders who can act as resources to local schools on a continuing basis.

4. Communicate concern about bias in textbooks and other educational materials to publishers and to legislators.

5. Establish a review committee in State adoption and recommendation procedures to monitor curricular materials for bias.

6. Support the local development of new curricular materials for use in local schools and classrooms. Encourage innovative solutions on the part of classroom teachers, curriculum specialists, and local administrators.

7. Involve community groups and parents in the effort to eliminate sex bias. ●

COUNSELING: POTENTIAL SUPERBOMB AGAINST SEXISM

by Mary Ellen Verheyden-Hilliard

The requirement to eliminate sexism in counseling practice and procedures is no longer a matter of debate. It is a matter of Federal law. Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 prohibits sex discrimination and states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

In considering the responsibility and influence of counselors, it becomes clear why Title IX extends to counseling. Counselors are the official resource persons for students at all educational levels who seek help concerning educational plans, career goals, and personal and interpersonal decisions. They are the official referral sources for parents and for educators concerned about the behaviors and attitudes of students at all levels of education. The counselor who is also educator trains new counselors, teaches those counselors who return to school for further training, and conducts inservice courses in local school systems. Counselors thus have the potential to influence not only students and the counseling profession but classroom teachers and administrators.

Clearly, counselors can provide critical intervention services supporting sex-fair education, or they can remain gatekeepers of the status quo. Presently the research and literature indicate that counselor preparation and practice are perceived to be, with few and notable exceptions, sexist and discriminatory; the field clings to outmoded procedures based on male-centered psychology and counseling theory, to male-centered vocational

---

Ms. Verheyden-Hilliard, an education consultant in Washington, D.C., worked with the task force.

development, and to 19th-century notions of what is "normal" and "appropriate" for women and men to do and to be. Individual counselors are not solely responsible for the sexist social values reflected in the educational structure, and counselors in general are not the only educators perceived as behaving in a sexually discriminatory manner. However, counselors can be charged with the responsibility to apply special scrutiny to both their programs and their individual practices.

The fact that sex bias is imbedded in counseling practices and training is documented in *Sex Discrimination in Guidance and Counseling*. This massive report, produced for the Commissioner of Education to fulfill a requirement of the Women's Educational Equity Act of 1974 for a "national, comprehensive review of sex discrimination in education," was released in February 1976 by the Higher Education Research Institute.

Further evidence of sex bias can be found by consulting the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC) retrieval system, which lists nearly 300 items based on key words such as counselor, woman, girl, counselor education, sexism. In light of the evidence, it is impossible to ignore the fact that much is and has been unsatisfactory about counseling practice and training as it relates to women and girls.

The concept of androgyny is increasingly providing a way to look afresh at sex roles by challenging norms inherent in personality theories and counseling practices which assume that healthy males and females are those who adhere strictly to, respectively, "masculine" and "feminine" stereotypic behavior. This challenge to traditional polarities of sex-role identification stems not from a desire to promote "unisex" but from thoughtful, common-sense consideration of the realities of life. Says Sandra Bem, psychologist at Stanford University, "For fully effective and healthy human functioning, both masculinity and femininity must each be tempered by the other and the two must be integrated into a balanced, more fully human, truly androgynous personality."

The most integrated functioning personality will incorporate both male-associated and female-associated traits to a high degree. Thus, counseling that promotes stereotypic masculine and feminine roles is at odds with the helping profession's mandate to work toward the development of the full potential of every individual. In order to function optimally, every individual, male or female, needs assertiveness, independence, strength, and the ability to relate to other human beings in a considerate, caring way. The question becomes: Where and how can the counseling profession aid in achieving this goal?

Elementary School

According to sociologist Alice Rossi, the "childhood model of the quiet, good, sweet girl will not produce many women scientists or scholars, doctors or engineers." Not every girl need be a scientist, scholar, doctor, or engineer, but it has become increasingly apparent that allowing the feminine stereotype to go unchallenged, even in elementary school, may have long-range cognitive consequences.

Psychologist Eleanor Maccoby asked the people who worked on the Fels Research Institute longitudinal study of gifted children, "What kind of developmental history is necessary to make a girl into an intellectual person?" The answer: "She must be a tomboy at some point in her childhood." The Fels study also indicated that the girls and boys whose IQ's rose during elementary school were those who were independent, self-assertive, and dominant in interaction with other children. The girls and boys whose IQ's fell during elementary school were the children who were passive, shy, and dependent.

It does not take a great deal of scholarly thought to figure out which list of adjectives is more likely to be associated with traditional expectations for girls and which for boys. Educators and parents are more likely to view with alarm the elementary-school boy who is passive, shy, and dependent than a girl behaving in the same way. The girl would be viewed as naturally conforming to the sex-role expectations held for her.

Some related consequences of such expectations may be indicated in the report of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. Nationwide, girls who were equal to their brothers at age 9 were by age 13 falling behind in math, science, and social studies. The decline continued through their late teens and into young adulthood.

Counselors, if they are indeed to be facilitators of human growth, must be helped to understand the lasting consequences of sex stereotyping. For example, the girls encouraged to believe that mathematics is of no significant importance to their lives are, at best, receiving totally inadequate preparation for adulthood in an increasingly technological world. As mathematician John Ernst and others have noted, ignorance of math will eliminate any chance of entering such fields as architecture, biology, engineering, physics, and economics. Mathematics is, according to sociologist Lucy Sells, "the critical filter." Without prerequisite courses, young women may not even enter the training programs of occupations in which they have aptitude or interest.

The pattern of falling behind in math, science, and social studies is similar to the pattern of limiting occupational aspiration. Past studies have indicated that by age 9, girls had already limited their occupational aspirations to teacher, nurse, secretary, or mother. Although a more recent study found that some girls are beginning to consider a somewhat larger variety of occupations, the research also indicates that these girls cannot describe in any detail the career they aspire to. Young boys, on the other hand, can describe in detail what they would be doing in a chosen occupation.

A counselor's opportunities for supporting and promoting new occupational choices by girls may be greatest at the elementary-school level. PTA meetings, assemblies, career-education projects, and classroom activities provide myriad opportunities for the elementary-school counselor to keep open—or to widen—the horizons of girls and to win the support of parents.

Many schools are currently involved in career-education programs and career days, though, unfortunately, some of these activities are tradition bound and therefore sex biased. Many books and films on career education primarily portray women in traditional female occupations and it is therefore important to make students *and* their parents aware of those women who have expanded their occupational horizons. One way to do this, notes the Chamber of Commerce booklet *Career Education*, is through emphasis on classroom visits and special career days in which women employed in nonstereotypic jobs participate.

Though educators tend to see vocational planning as something that begins in secondary school, the research—at least on girls—notes that high school may be too late. Decisions are made by age 9, failure in occupationally linked subjects begins by age 13, and planning by parents for the financial costs of education for their daughters should begin long before senior high school. Therefore, the elementary-school counselor can intervene at a critical time to help parents, children, and school staff prepare for the reality, necessity, and acceptability of the changing role of adult women.

Summary of Survey of Counselor Preparation Program

In the spring of 1976, a questionnaire was distributed to all 420 counselor-education programs listed in *Counselor Education Directory*; 173 institutions filled in and returned the forms.

While not definitive in any sense, the survey provides some interesting preliminary information to those concerned about the counseling of girls and women:

—22 percent of the institutions offer a separate course in the general area of counseling girls and women.

—5 percent offer a separate course on counseling boys and men.

—39 percent have made a copy of Title IX or Section 86.36 available to all members of the department.

The questionnaire concluded with a scaled response to the question "What is your view on the importance of training counselors to deal with the special needs of girls and women?"

—17 percent of respondents said the need was critical.

—52 percent thought it very important.

—23 percent thought it somewhat important.

—0.01 percent found it unimportant.

—6 percent did not reply to the question.

It should be noted that though 69 percent of the respondents felt training counselors to deal with the special needs of girls and women was critical or very important, only 22 percent offered a separate course in the general area of counseling girls and women.

Secondary School

In 1973 the American College Testing Program conducted a nationwide career-development study of 32,000 representative students in 200 schools. The research revealed that over half of the young women in the 11th grade had chosen occupations from only three job categories: Clerical and secretarial, educational and social services, and nursing and human care. Eighth graders tested at the same time made choices similar to those of the 11th graders. Boys tested in the study had choices paralleling those of the girls only 7 percent of the time. Nearly half of the boys' choices were scattered among the technologies and trades categories.

This study seems to refute the belief that times are changing and that this school generation is beginning to disregard traditional roles. The occupations chosen by the girls are the same ones actually pursued by women in the current labor force. The largest number of working women (48 percent) are in clerical and service jobs (service meaning jobs such as beautician and waitress), and the majority of women in fields defined as professional are teachers in elementary and secondary schools, with health workers claiming the next largest number. Girls continue to choose the careers of secretary and teacher because they have a better understanding of these careers; they have observed many females in those roles, and they can see that those careers are acceptable and possible for women.

Girls also choose traditional female careers because these careers are perceived to be compatible with a primary role of wife, mother, and housekeeper. Moreover, girls—and their parents—continue to believe that the choice of whether or not to work outside the home when they are adults rests with them. In addition to challenging the assumption that dependence is a satisfactory way of life for an adult woman, counselors and other educators have a responsibility to point out the following statistics to their students:

- —54 percent of American women between the ages of 18 and 65 are currently in the work force.
- —40 percent of the total American work force is female.
- —If a woman is married, she can expect to work an average of 25 years—and 45 years if she is single.

—Even though a woman has children, she can expect to work; 13 million women in the labor force have children.

—Even 4.8 million women with preschool children work.

—One out of ten women in the labor force and one out of five minority women are heads of families.

—The divorce rate is up 109 percent since 1962 and is still rising.

—Fathers by and large contribute less than half the support of children in broken families, and enforcement of payment obligations seldom occurs.

—Women live longer than men. The longevity rate has increased 20.16 years, while the men's rate has increased only 13.9.

—More than two-thirds of the poor over age 65 are women. These statistics clearly refute many of the stereotypic notions girls have of their futures.

Applying a theory of occupational choice to what the literature tells us about females, we can demonstrate that girls, as a result of socialization, are making compromises about their future. Eli Ginzberg, economist and educator, hypothesized that boys up to age 11 make "fantasy choices" about occupations because at this point they do not or cannot assess capabilities and simply wish to be whatever interests them. Girls, however, do not make fantasy choices. They limit themselves primarily to teacher, health worker, secretary, and mother. The socialization has been so intense that girls apparently may not even dream.

Dr. Ginzberg's theory then suggests that children after age 11 move on to make tentative occupational choices by considering the various possibilities and the satisfaction they offer. A study of the occupational choices of 12-year-olds, which was based on Dr. Ginzberg's occupational theory, presented some interesting data about "mature" choices. Using Dr. Ginzberg's maturity index, the study found that 74 percent of the girls but only 41 percent of the boys at age 12 were making tentative occupational choices. These children—black, white, middle class and lower class—were also tested for intelligence. The findings indicated that more mature choices correlate with intelligence and female sex but not with race or socioeconomic environment. In sum, the most mature choices were made by intelligent girls, whether they were black or white, rich or poor. Whatever the occupational choices were, the 12-year-old girls were prepared to expect that only certain jobs were open to them, and they were thus acting on the message they had received.

Dr. Ginzberg suggested that, after age 17, young people make realistic occupational choices based on interest, ability, and opportunity. Obviously, "realistic" has an entirely different meaning for girls because their choices have little to do with intelligence or demonstrated ability and much to do with the special circumstances of their socialization.

Finally, any discussion of students in secondary school is incomplete without observing that peer pressure to conform to peer norms is fierce at the adolescent level. But adults are also responsible for encouraging adolescent conformity. As parents and as school personnel, adults consistently encourage and reward conforming girls who are popular with males and well-liked by all.

What are the consequences of such socialization and pressure for girls—particularly for the capable, intelligent, achieving girl? In school she continues to do well, encouraged by her own abilities. But the girl who maintains into her teens the freedom of movement, competitiveness, and outspokenness associated with "tomboy" behavior is not generally viewed as behaving normally. Indeed, she may provoke much anxiety among traditionally minded adults. Yet, the bold, assertive girl, far from needing to be counseled to be softer and more feminine, might well be the very person we should support and look to for leadership and academic success.

High school counselors can provide support and encouragement to the nonconforming but achieving girl. They can present challenging alternatives to the girls who continue to lock themselves into stereotypic, traditional roles. Counselors can also help parents who are in need of nontraditional information and encouragement to provide emotional and financial support for their daughter's new-found options. Counselors rightly do not want to force their values on anyone else; however, those who allow high school girls to graduate still locked into the "Cinderella Syndrome" (the belief that girls and women need not pursue a life independent of or even parellel to their traditional roles of wife, mother, and housekeeper) abdicate their responsibility to provide accurate information and guidance to the student.

Postsecondary

Whether in saddle shoes and sweater sets of another generation or in the frayed jeans of today, a college woman, unlike her male peer, is more likely to be judged by her appearance than her capabilities. In addition she often brings with her a bundle of sex-stereotype feelings and responses that have now become so much a part of her that neither she nor those who work with her can be sure which goals she would choose if unencumbered by traditional expectations.

Young women attending college today may be more aware of the goals of the women's movement and may profess their independence and career aspirations. However, feelings of personal liberation often have little to do with understanding what it takes to achieve and maintain a career goal.

Norma Simon, who formerly chaired the Commission on Women of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, has said: "These young college women often are in conflict. The emotional drag of years of traditional training and beliefs about being a woman and about what women ought to aspire to has a powerful clutch on each woman's inner life. . . . The counselor must, of necessity, interweave all areas of the young woman's life and particularly those which affect academic and career decisions." To aid in that decisionmaking process, the college counselor needs not only sensitivity to sex role stereotypes but knowledge of the impact traditional college behaviors and expectations may have on college women.

Counseling psychologist L. W. Oliver indicated that a woman opting for traditional roles has a high need for affiliation and a low need for achievement. Conversely, the young woman who is career oriented has a low need for affiliation and a high need for achievement. Sandra Tangri, a psychologist, found that self-reliance, independence, somewhat untraditional attitudes about sex roles, and tolerance for postponing marriage were factors in maintaining new roles among some women. The possible effects of coeducation on women's aspirations should be recognized by counselors in order to provide the counteracting support women students may need.

The presence of males on campus does not seem to affect women's academic achievement. Three studies by the American

Council on Education indicated that women achieved substantially higher grade-point averages than men. Yet women set lower educational goals for themselves, even when their intellectual abilities were equal.

Males on campus seem to promote an atmosphere that may not be supportive of nontraditionalism on the part of college women. Researcher Grey-Shellberg has shown college men to be significantly more "anti-feminist" than noncollege men. Another researcher, Marlene Katz of the Educational Testing Service, found college men to react punitively to stories of women successful in nontraditional roles. Sociologist Cynthia Epstein has noted: "Girls are not only led to believe that they endanger their heterosexual relationship by aggressiveness in thinking, initiating, and exploring, but they in fact encounter punishment by their male peers who may support their activities ideologically but reject them in favor of girls who make them feel important." The fact, demonstrated by C. Tomilson-Keasey, that younger unmarried college women had significantly more fear of success than married college women supports the notion that women fear men's reactions to their success. Indeed, young women may need to learn to deal with their fear of male disapproval rather than, as is more commonly supposed, their fear of success.

The counselor who genuinely wants to open or keep open the door of choice and options for women must prepare an intervention strategy which may be at odds with traditional collegiate myths and stereotypes. Counselor Rita Whitely has suggested establishing innovative groups in which women can explore the impact of feminism on educated women and in which self-worth can be self-defined rather than male defined.

Whether in counseling centers, women's centers, or individual consultation, a young college woman needs a support system for her goals that is independent of male approval. She needs to discover some of the research on college women and the reality of adult women's lives, and she needs a place where she can find others who are like-minded. Thus, a critical campus counseling activity that has long-range implications is building a support system for women seeking a self-determined life plan and for those seeking the information, incentive, and support to exorcise fears of male disapproval which fuel their fear of success.

Continuing Education

Of increasing importance in education is counseling the re-entry woman who has already made life choices that she wants to reconsider or renegotiate through continued education. Mature women—those beyond the traditional college age who also may be married and have children—often consider themselves free to expand their roles and pursue their own educational and career interests. Although it is commonly believed that all these women are white and middle class, growing numbers, according to educator B. J. Miller, are from the working class and from minority and poverty groups. The increase of women considering and undertaking education and careers outside the home is reflected in the expanding continuing-education programs and community counseling centers serving mature women.

Counselors need to understand where the re-entry woman has been and where she wants to go. As has been noted, pressures from family and community are particularly hard on the re-entry woman, requiring counselors to be sensitive and supportive, alleviating the mature woman's lack of confidence and preventing her from settling for training and education that are not in line with her interests and abilities.

Counseling psychologists B. S. Farmer and M. J. Bohn have demonstrated the benefits of active counselor intervention and the importance of training counselors to provide positive intervention for women and girls. They gave an "interest inventory" using standard instructions to 50 working women—25 married, 25 single, and all over 40 years of age. Before taking the same test a second time, the women were given an exhortatory talk introducing them to research that found women to be afraid to appear too intelligent or to choose demanding training because they thought it would be incompatible with raising a family. The instructor also wrote on the chalkboard that men like intelligent women, that men and women are promoted equally in business and the professions, and that raising a family is possible for a career woman. The women were asked to "pretend" that all men believed this and that it was generally true. With this in mind, they were to take the test again. The result was that within what the authors called a "sympathetic set," the women's career aspirations rose so much that it affected career interpretations. The authors suggested that the change in career aspirations of young girls would be even greater than that of these older women. Clearly, women were more likely to reveal their true aspirations if they thought their career goals were possible and acceptable.

This study reveals that older women impose the same limitations on themselves as do younger women and girls. The pattern of self-limitation and compromise based on sex stereotyping evidently begins early and stays late. Aside from personal rewards in continuing their educational and career development, women face a serious practical problem: Support in old age and possibly widowhood. The situation of a woman who has been dependent on her husband all her life is clearly a poignant one. "The older [people] are, the poorer they are and the greater the proportion of women," says a report from *Industrial Gerontology* called "Problem Potentials of Work and Age." "This baleful situation results from these realities: Most wives outlive their husbands, married women often depend upon their husband's incomes, social-security benefits for widows are low, and private pensions generally do not provide for widow's benefits. The future may be better, but probably not much." Counselor training programs must thus ensure that counselors understand how this terrible waste occurs at all ages and levels of education, and they must provide counselors with intervention methods and techniques.

Counselor Preparation: A New Perspective

The traditional counseling textbooks and theories not only reinforce sex-role stereotypes but, however inadvertently, pose discrimination as a norm. Remembering that "tomboy" behavior, independence, and assertiveness were cited as precursors to female academic achievement, one can see the harm inherent in traditional psychological and counseling theory promoting passivity and dependence in girls and women.

The need to infuse counseling theory with a nonstereotypical view of appropriate behavior and expectations for girls and women is no longer a point for debate. Independent research, major nationwide studies, Census Bureau statistics, and the findings of the National Assessment of Educational Progress all indicate that counseling practice is either overtly or covertly sex biased.

However, nonsexist counseling theory, though important, will do little to eliminate sexist counseling practice unless it is translated into training programs. Counselor training, both preservice and inservice, must be restructured to include major components on the new psychology of women, the concept of androgyny, the reality of women's lives, and the changing woman in a changing world.

The responsibility for counselor-preparation programs rests presently with male administrators. They should be held accountable for programs that continue to discourage and limit the aspirations of women. Chief state school officers, who are responsible for inservice programs for counselors, should be held similarly accountable. Administrators can influence their departments or systems, and on them lies the responsibility for getting out the message that counselor preparation and counselor inservice programs must take an affirmative stance on eliminating sex bias and sex discrimination.

There is no one place in which to intervene to solve all the problems of sex-role stereotyping in the educational system or society. It is imbedded, internalized, and supported by every social institution one could name. However, sex-role conceptions are malleable, and research indicates that even brief attempts to hammer them out of their old cultural stereotypic shapes can yield good results. Now there is a new and potent tool to help: the requirement to comply with Title IX.

Eliminating sexism in counseling must begin everywhere and at once: with elementary-school children before the mold is cast, with secondary-school students before it is too late, with college students before they make irreversible educational and career decisions, and with continuing-education students who have what is likely to be their last chance. The concern here is not with a numerical minority. Or even a majority. The concern is with all those whom sex-role stereotyping affects—and that is everybody.

Counselors are potential change agents who already have roles in almost every educational institution in the Nation. They are trained for group work and responsiveness to individual needs. Now much of that training is derived from a philosophical and theoretical base that is sex stereotyped. Thus, even the most skilled persons can bring into their work a destructive orientation. If that base and the sexist practice resulting from it were to be changed, counselors could use their skills to develop nonstereotypic concepts in students, parents, and colleagues.

To do so, however, counselors need preservice and inservice training, materials, and support. Sex discrimination in education is against the law. The need is great. The time is now. ●

SEXISM'S UNIVERSAL CURRICULUM

by Kathleen Bonk and JoAnn Evans Gardner

Television is part of the educator's reality. Regardless of what is taught in school, students will use television as a major reference source about the world.

Writing in *Psychology Today*, George Gerbner and Larry Gross put this thought in broader context: "Unlike newspapers and magazines, television does not require literacy. Unlike the movies, it runs continuously, and once purchased, costs almost nothing. Unlike radio, it can show as well as tell. Unlike theater or the movies, it does not require leaving the home. With virtually unlimited access, television both precedes literature and increasingly preempts it.

"Never before have such large and varied publics—from the nursery to the nursing home, from ghetto tenement to penthouse—shared so much of the same cultural messages and images, and the assumptions embedded in them. Television offers a *universal curriculum* that everyone can learn."

It is not surprising that concern about harmful adventitious learning from television is rapidly becoming acute. Advocates of equality between women and men are well aware that, as an educational tool, television has enormous potential, both constructive and distorting.

Consider the statistics: There are approximately 112 million television sets in the 65.8 million American homes. Ninety-seven percent of all homes have one or more sets. The number of homes with television sets outnumbers those with indoor plumbing. The average set is turned on 6 hours and 49 minutes per day—or almost 2,500 hours per year. By the time a student graduates from high school, he or she will have spent roughly

---

Ms. Bonk chaired the Media Task Force of the National Organization for Women; Ms. Gardner is a psychologist in Pittsburgh. Caroline Isber, a consultant for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, also contributed to this article.

11,000 hours in the classroom and 15,000 hours in front of a television set, bombarded by more than 640,000 commercial messages.

The consensus of a large number of studies is that

—children typically begin viewing television regularly 3 or 4 years before entering the first grade;

—the amount of viewing increases during the elementary-school years, then decreases during the high-school years;

—children develop tastes in television programs as early as age 3, and tastes relate to age, sex, and race.

Given the importance of television as an educational tool and the fact that television magnifies the biases of the culture regarding females and males, together with recommendations of how educators can monitor TV for fair treatment in programing, it might be inferred that educators, in the interest of fairness to girls and boys, will be able to compensate for sexism over the airwaves through a variety of means. Until very recently, remarkably little systematic attention has been directed toward television's capacity to teach or to the nature of the curriculum. Those who have worked on eliminating or at least reducing sexism in textbooks can point to guidelines written and published by at least six major textbook publishers. No comparable "successes" have been achieved from attempts to change television programing practices.

Alberta Siegel, a member of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior gives five possible reasons for this neglect: (1) The nonresults from studies of the effects of movies carried out in the 1920s and 1930s discouraged study of the effects of television. (2) At the time TV developed, psychologists were preoccupied with stimulus-response models of behavior and the idea that reinforcements contingent upon response were crucial for learning. Nothing about TV is contingent on the behavior of the viewer except turning it on or off. (3) It is expensive to do research on TV, and even when money had been available, most researchers were of the opinion that it could be better used on more urgent matters. (4) Psychologists are committed to the idea that to experiment is better than to study correlations. And experiments are not well suited to the study of gradual, long-term, possibly insidious effects. So it was not until Albert Bandura demonstrated experimentally that children can acquire new responses through observation and imitation of filmed or videotaped models (without external reinforcements) that serious interest in the problem developed. (5) There is no animal model.

Recent studies about how and what television teaches, however, have provided "ammunition" for educators and women's advocate groups in their battle with TV producers, sponsors, broadcasters, and regulatory agencies. One of these studies was the work and conclusions of the Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, which "proved" that adventitious learning occurs. Initiated in 1969 by the action of Senator John Pastore, an inquiry which lasted nearly 3 years and cost over $1.8 million culminated in a report that concluded: "Thus, the two sets of findings (experimental and survey) converge in three respects: a preliminary and tentative indication of a causal relation between viewing violence on television and aggressive behavior; an indication that any such causal relation operates only on some children (who are predisposed to be aggressive); and an indication that it operates only in some environmental contexts. . . ."

Recognizing the potential of television as a teacher, several Government agencies and private foundations announced in 1968 that they had jointly appropriated $8 million to support Joan Ganz Cooney's "Television for Pre-school Children." By the summer of 1969, enough progress had been made that Gerald Lesser, chairman of the board of advisors of Children's Television Workshop, was able to show several sequences from *Sesame Street* to a symposium at the convention of the American Psychological Association. Said Mr. Lesser, "*Sesame Street* uses direct methods to teach basic intellectual skills but adopts indirect teaching methods to display certain social attitudes such as people treating each other with kindness and courtesy, respect for racial differences, taking another person's point of view, modes of conflict resolution, and accepting rules of justice and fair play."

Sesame Street provided the first real evidence, beyond scattered anecdotes from parents, of the remarkable rate at which young children can learn from television, according to Mr. Lesser. Thus, with the Surgeon General's Report and *Sesame Street*, there was available for the first time substantial scientific evidence that children learn from television. This includes not only what they are intended to learn, but much that many thoughtful people would rather they didn't learn.

Criticism of the universal curriculum offered on TV does not rest on over-simplification and repetition, but strikes out at the unrepresentation and the misrepresentation of society's population. Although women make up slightly more than half the population, only 20 percent of all characters on television are female. On children's programs, minority characters are presented as uniformly pleasant and well-mannered, a formula that erases the diversity of character and personality with which they as a group are endowed.

To the extent that television does not reflect reality, it introduces children into a fictitious and distorted social system where criminals are always caught or eliminated, usually the instant before committing some additional heinous act, the guilty always break down and admit their guilt in the courtroom, the most difficult problems are solved in an hour, and it's normal for things to work out for the best. All this comes about with little help from minorities or the elderly, who are rarely seen. Many viewers, having only the sketchiest notion of what goes on inside a courtroom, a police station, or hospital, give full credence to TV programs, as witness the fact that Marcus Welby, M.D., received 250,000 letters during his 5-year television practice, most of them containing requests for medical advice.

In addition to commercial and public television, which is usually viewed by students during after-school hours, Instructional Television (ITV) is widely used as a teaching tool. The core of instructional programing, or ITV, is material broadcast for use by teachers and students in schoolrooms from kindergarten to 12th grade. The daytime schedule contains a variety of programs seldom encountered by people outside the ITV community. These programs are seen by tens of thousands, if not millions, of schoolchildren across the country (Totals vary widely by program, and estimates are not fully reliable). In addition, ITV programing includes teaching-training materials broadcast during or after school hours, college-level courses broadcast for students enrolled for credit, and continuing-education and high-school equivalency courses broadcast for adults who wish to use television for education in their homes. Therefore, television has become not only a teaching tool in the classroom, but also a vehicle after school for instruction and entertainment.

An early alarm concerning sex-role stereotyping on television was raised by women who worked in advertising and public relations. They understood, professionally, the power of commercial TV to get its message across and the fact that much of every advertiser's message was conveyed indirectly. When they looked at the covert messages about women that television was propagating, they were appalled. By 1970, these women from the advertising industry had set up the Image of Women Task Force of the National Organization for Women (NOW). Their first action was to develop a list of proposals for "consciousness-raising in the media" meant to improve the images of women and men on TV.

Later some women psychologists developed nationwide concern for sex-role stereotyping in television and its potential harm to children, especially in educational television. *Sesame Street*, the first target for feminist criticism because it was the first systematic effort to fuse education and entertainment in a preschool program, received a "flood" of protest mail, and a meeting between the psychologists and Joan Ganz Cooney, the show's producer, was arranged. At the meeting were two of the developers of the Sex-Role Stereotypes Questionnaire who later prepared a critical analysis of the program's sex stereotyping with suggestions for its elimination.

Another outcome of the meeting was that the producers of *Sesame Street* hired two NOW consultants to study the issue. They compiled a substantially similar report which documented the show's sexism. KNOW, Inc., a feminist publishing company, reproduced and disseminated both papers widely and also published "Sexism on Sesame Street," an 8,000 word critique of a single show, which further documented the program's imbalance.

Although the promoters of *Sesame Street* complained that criticism of the show on such small samples was unfair, they also tacitly admitted that the imbalance was deliberate. Gerald Lesser wrote: "We had decided to stress the importance of strong male-identification figures for inner-city children. In most public education for young children, women teachers predominate, and, possibly as a consequence, girls seem to meet teachers' expectations with less difficulty than boys. For both reasons, we decided to show men on *Sesame Street* in warm, nurturing relationships with young children. We did not intend, however, to bolster male identification at the expense of misrepresenting or excluding feminine models, and as time went on, we searched for opportunities to present females in positive, distinctive roles. However, since some trade-offs are necessary when competing options are encountered, we knew that we could not be everything to everybody."

In the *Report of the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting,* Carolyn Isber and Muriel Cantor write with respect to *Sesame Street*: "The few female characters shown were likely to be involved in themes of teaching numbers, words, and sounds, and men were often involved in themes associated with career awareness and reasoning and problem-solving. Males were found to initiate action strongly more often than female characters, and males talked more than female characters. Females were in nonactive roles three times as often as males. Males were seen for longer periods of time than females." The report, released in 1975, clearly indicates feminist criticism had had little effect on *Sesame Street* in spite of the fact that Mr. Lesser himself stresses that children learn by watching and listening to others even in the absence of reinforcement and overt practice and that opportunities for modeling have been vastly increased by television.

Another recent study, *Channeling Children,* documents economic and behavioral patterns of women and men in commercial programing and advertisements during the 1973–74 top-rated prime-time network shows. The report concludes, "More males than females appear on all shows analyzed. Large differences in numbers of male and female characters are evident when adventure shows are compared with situation comedies." The report goes on to state, "Perhaps the most interesting finding on male/female behaviors is in the area of competence. . . . Women on the shows studied spent 20 percent of their total behavior in incompetent acts. Men, on the other hand, were incompetent for only 9 percent of their total behavior."

When describing commercial messages, the report states, ". . . commercials are part of the overall television viewing experience, and for many children as well as adults, the commercial message appears to be just one more piece of information from the television set—information that is presented more explicitly and more persuasively than most. Children are not as able as adults to separate truth in advertising from fiction, particularly when the fiction is presented in catchy music, compelling words, and striking images. When an authoritative voice is heard summarizing the products' virtues and urging their purchase and use, the voice is almost always male. . . ."

The report summarizes: "They [children] see more men than women on their television screens: on the exciting adventure shows, they see nearly six times as many men. The men they see work in diverse occupations, nearly twice the number of those held by women characters. They see three-quarters of the adult males in shows about families contributing to family support, and only one-third of adult females helping with the support. . . . The prime-time message of the television screen is that there are more men around, and that they are dominant, authoritative, and competent."

In 1974, the *Journal of Communications* (Volume 24, No. 2) featured a symposium on women which contained nine reports on women's role and image in the media. Comparing the findings and methods used in four content studies of the images of women and men projected in television commercials, the conclusion was "that men and women are presented differently in advertising and that women are not portrayed as autonomous, independent human beings, but are primarily sex typed."

In October 1975, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB) published the *Report of the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting,* which examined the place of women in programing and employment. An underlying rationale for monitoring programing distributed through the Public Broadcasting Service was that "the portrayal of women and girls through the media is a dynamic force in determining attitudes about women, and television in particular is a major socializing agent." The monitoring forms were designed by the staff so that characters and participants could be counted; their appearances timed; their occupation, sex, and race recorded; and the topic discussed or activity performed noted.

The report stated: "In all, there were 37 television programs, consisting of 58 individual episodes monitored. For analytical purposes, the programing was divided into five categories: (1) general adult programing—panel, documentary, news, interview, public affairs, and general information; (2) promotions; (3) drama; (4) music; and (5) children's programing."

In the adult television programs monitored, 200 men and only 36 women appeared. Of the 28 adult programs, 11 (representing a total of 6 hours, 17 minutes of the available 18 hours) *had no women participants*. There were only 4 black women out of the total of 236 participants. Of the 11 public-affairs programs, 7 excluded women completely. In the remaining, there were 11 females and 90 males. Moreover, only one program dealt with a woman's issue. Other categories showed similar findings.

But it is in children's programing that the data are most disturbing. Not only does children's programing account for a large segment of time (15½ hours) but it attracts the largest audience. In all, there were 792 male characters and 362 female characters. The variations from program to program are large.

The principal finding from the studies conducted was that women are indeed vastly underrepresented in public broadcasting both on the air and at policymaking levels. Based on its finding, the task force developed recommendations designed to make public broadcasting perform up to its responsibilities with respect to the interests of women in the United States.

In order to correct or compensate for the antifemale bias in television, it is important to look carefully at the *Report of the Task Force on Women in Public Broadcasting*. The findings and methods for assessing fair treatment could provide a useful model for educators who may wish to conduct their own program-content analysis.

The Commission on the Observance of International Women's Year (IWY) developed guidelines or minimum standards of fairness and accuracy in the treatment of women in the media. Two of these guidelines relate to employment and recommend that women in media should be employed at all job levels and should be paid equally with men for work of equal value; and that a special effort should be made to employ women who are knowledgeable about and sensitive to women's changing roles.

Additionally, these guidelines call for the enlargement of the media's conception of how news relates to women and the desegregation of its presentation, immediate changes in sexual exploitation, revisions in gender designation and titles, and positive coverage of activities of the feminist movement.

Except for the IWY Commission recommendations, there are no guidelines for the treatment of women on television to match the excellent ones developed by textbook and tradebook companies. A logical explanation for this lack may be found in the difficulty experienced by advocacy groups in demonstrating unequivocally the essential dangers of sexist programing. The technical burdens of monitoring and analyzing television, as compared with textbooks or print media, very often discourage pressure groups from collecting and disseminating information on the content and effects of that medium.

Television's fast-moving, difficult-to-collect messages require costly monitoring devices—videotape equipment, for example—as well as trained monitors and professional statisticians. Moreover, limiting data collection to pertinent factors and designing monitoring forms for the multidimensions of television can, on the one hand, become an endless problem for the novice. Textbooks, on the other hand, can be monitored by parents and educators.

The mass media generally and television specifically have as great potential for social change as for maintaining the status quo. Television can exercise a significant influence in helping to remove prejudices and stereotypes, or it can accelerate existing sex-role stereotypes. Television can increase the acceptance of women's and men's new and expanding roles in society and promote their full integration into the development process as equal partners or it can continue to stunt the potential of every little girl and boy.

Until, as a society, we identify television as a lifelong learning experience and until there is general recognition that sexism is a serious political concern, improvements on the "tubed school" will be minimal. No checklist or set of guidelines can ensure that misconceptions about women and men are not perpetuated. This will require conscious, sustained efforts to change fundamental attitudes. Educators must pay immediate attention to television, the teacher and the entertainer, and to the learning experience television provides. ●

NO ROOM AT THE TOP?

Women aspiring to careers in educational administration are more than likely to be surrounded by problems and beset with frustrations. And this despite a body of research which consistently documents the finding that in schools with women administrators the self-image and career aspirations of female students and, in fact, the total school climate is generally of higher than usual caliber and quality.

The underused and untapped talents of aspiring women administrators are needed to improve the quality of education on all levels. While equality of opportunity for women in education is an admirable goal in itself, the advantages to the educational system and to society that can be expected when women achieve positions of educational leadership in significant numbers are too persuasive to be ignored or delayed.

An argument that gives women a footing equal to that now enjoyed by men in educational administration is easily shot full of holes by statistics. Consider the status of women in elementary and secondary education, where they constitute approximately 66 percent of the teaching force but make up only 15 percent of the school principals. Nor can this dismal proportion be shrugged off with an assumption that things are getting better. The number of female administrators has in fact decreased rather than increased.

Although the number of degrees in educational administration conferred on women has decreased slightly between 1960 and 1970, the percentage drop in the number of female principals is startling. In 1928, women were actually a majority of

---

Major contributors to this article are: Jacqueline P. Clement, assistant superintendent of schools, Brookline, Massachusetts; Cecilia M. Di Bella associate planner, Massachusetts Department of Education; Ruth B. Eckstrom, research psychologist, Educational Testing Service; Sheila Tobias, associate provost, Wesleyan University; and research assistance from Kay Bartol, Syracuse University, and staff assistance from Margarita Alban, National Conference of Women in Education.

elementary-school principals, holding down 55 percent of the posts. In 1973, however, only 158,864 elementary and secondary principals were women.

In 1970–71, there were 158,864 elementary and secondary administrators—principals; superintendents; deputy, associate, and assistant superintendents; and other central office staff members. Of these, 12,581 were superintendents in basic units and an additional estimated 1,500 superintendents were at the intermediate level. Most of these administrators were decision-makers in small systems (300–2,999 students). Large systems, with an enrollment of 25,000 or more, had 192 superintendents. Medium-sized systems, enrolling 3,000–24,999 students, had an estimated 3,000 superintendents. The medium and large systems together represented 80 percent of all superintendencies in the United States, and men occupied 99.4 percent of these positions.

At present it is widely believed that there is not a sufficient number of qualified women available to eliminate the sex imbalance in leadership positions. Nevertheless, the differences in professional training are not sufficient to justify the substantial difference in the number of men and women in administrative positions.

The evidence suggests that criteria other than task competence and qualifications are employed in the selection of educational administrators. One researcher has discovered that "among the informal ingredients of a superintendent's background one finds that the chances are almost 8 in 10 that the person has coached a sport." Another study of selection of administrators for elementary and secondary schools found that the only factor that appeared to have any significance in hiring for educational administration was sex. Age, type of position, length of experience, background, size of school or district have no valid correlation with the hiring process. A third observation revealed that men who have been in the military are preferred in the positions of school administrators.

In 1971–72, women received 6 percent of the doctoral degrees and 21 percent of the master's degrees in educational administration. Yet in the following year, only three of all the administrative categories had more than 6 percent women—principals and assistant principals in elementary and junior high schools, and "other central office administrators," a category that does not include a rank as high as superintendent. Obviously women have received a far greater number of degrees in educational administration than their ranks in the profession would suggest. In both elementary and secondary and in higher education, well-trained, credentialed women are simply not being promoted.

Hand in hand with the dearth of women in administrative positions in education are pay discrepancies between men and women in education. The National Bureau of the Census reported in 1970 that the average salary of female administrators in elementary and secondary education was almost $5,000 less than that of males. These salary differences between administrative men and women might be attributed in part to the fact that the women are working in smaller districts where pay and prestige are less. The qualification "in part" is necessary because it is well established that women are also paid less than men who perform the same functions in districts of the same size.

Unlike higher education, traditionally a male-dominated profession that has only recently begun to allow real access to women, elementary and secondary education has been a woman's occupation that has only recently become more and more male dominated. Several researchers have sought to determine the reasons for the decline in the number of female administrators. Gross and Trask suggest five possible explanations for the reduction in the number of women elementary-school principals:

- —outright discrimination against women in the promotion practices of many school districts;
- —informal male-preference policy by school boards, based on the belief that more men are needed in elementary schools;
- —school board overreaction to criticisms that elementary schools lack male role models and authority figures;
- —little concern for sex imbalance in school principalships shown by colleges and universities that train education administrators, and these institutions' use of financial aid and recruitment practices that favor males; and
- —a marked drop in the proportion of women teachers aspiring to school principalships.

The decrease in the number of female administrators in elementary and secondary education is sometimes attributed to the increased prestige that administrative positions have bestowed in the post-World War II years. This prestige is a reflection of the higher salaries administrators now command, the entry of veterans into education, and the popularity of the "executive image" that sprung up in the 1950s and 1960s. As elementary and secondary administrators began to get high salaries and an "executive image," the myth of the male administrator's superiority over the female administrator picked up momentum.

In a study of elementary-school administrators, Gross and Trask found that the "caliber of performance of both pupils and teachers was on the average of a higher quality in schools administered by women than in those managed by men." In the same study they shattered another myth: that both men and women are unhappy working for women, finding instead "no significant difference in the morale in schools administered by men and by women."

Edward J. Van Meir, writing in the *Journal* published by the National Association of Women Deans, Administrators and Counselors, cites more reasons for the lack of women in leadership roles in elementary and secondary education. First, he says that women are less well prepared academically to assume leadership roles. Second, women seem to be less motivated to attain leadership roles. Third, women appear to be more "transitory" than men. And fourth, women interrupt their careers to raise families.

One reason women are not motivated to enter education administration is the resistance they must overcome to attain high salaried, prestige positions. And, the statements that female career achievement is lower because women are more transitory and interrupt their careers for child rearing are simply not so. To be sure, the ages of men teachers represent a normal curve of distribution, strongly skewed to the younger groups, with the peak at 25–29 years, while the ages of women are in a bimodal distribution, with peaks at under 25 years and at 55–59 years. Yet, as Jaqueline Clement, assistant superintendent of Brookline (Massachusetts) school system, makes clear, the Gross and Trask studies further indicate that not only do women have more teaching experience than men, but that "63 percent of the men, in comparison with 33 percent of the women, became principals 15 years after entering teaching."

Ms. Clement supports the hypothesis that the reason for the very small number of women superintendents and school administrators may be that attention in recent years has been focused on attracting more men into the profession of teaching. The increase in male teachers in the elementary systems from 1957–68 was from 12.8 to 14.6 percent, and the increase at the secondary level went from 50.5 to 52.9 percent. The increase, however, could not alone account for the decline in women principals, which was 16 percent in the same decade. Women still predominate in the professional ranks from which school administrators are recruited.

The Status of Women in Higher Education

Of the 2,500 institutions of higher education surveyed by the American Council on Education's Office of Women in Higher Education, only 148 could claim a woman as their chief executive officer. Three-fourths of those institutions were church related. Only four institutions of higher education with an enrollment of more than 10,000 are headed by women (California State College, Sonoma State, Hunter College, and the University of Texas), and a woman also serves as chancellor of the Indiana University regional campuses. Well over half of the women's colleges are headed by men. Four prominent women's colleges (Goucher, Hood, Smith, and Wheaton) have each recently named a first woman president.

In considering whether these data indicate a lack of women qualified for administrative posts in higher education or whether they are evidence of discrimination against women in higher education, it is necessary to look at the sources from which administrators can be selected. These differ between elementary and secondary on the one hand and higher education on the other. Higher education has traditionally drawn its policy-making administrators from the faculty ranks. It is now beginning to recruit administrators who are trained in management skills, and some programs in educational administration now offer a degree in higher-education administration. These programs, however, do not provide access to positions of academic administration; rather they are paths to financial or student-affairs administration. In recent years, vice-presidents and presidents of institutions of higher education have also been recruited from the fields of law, business, government, and research, or nonprofit foundations and institutions.

Since many administrators in colleges and universities are still recruited from among faculty, comparative statistics on men and women faculty provide a kind of base-line figure for the talent pool potentially available as higher-education administrators. The 1975–76 statistics indicate that women made up 24 percent of all ranks of faculty. While this is an increase over preceding years, it is largely concentrated in the category of instructors. "Female representation in all other ranks stayed virtually constant between 1962–63 and 1972–73," says the National Center for Education Statistics.

The number of doctoral degrees conferred on women, after having declined for several decades, has increased from 10.4 percent of the total in 1960 to 19 percent of the total in 1974. The number of women who attain full professorships is not in proportion to the increase in the number of doctoral degrees conferred on women, however. According to the Newman report on higher education, women faculty are forced to wait 2 to 10 years longer for promotion than their male colleagues. Thus, one of the problems in higher education is that women do not rise to the ranks from which they can be promoted to administrative positions.

Study of institutional variations in the status of academic women revealed that women do not participate in the career ladder to the same degree as men. They tend to remain in academic positions that are entry-level posts for men. Another study found that women faculty in general serve less often and on less prestigious committees than do men, and that women faculty have low participation rates in all faculty-dominated administrative tasks. Bernice Sandler, director of the Women's Project of the Association of American Colleges, says that the "higher the prestige of an institution, the less likely there are to be any women in administrative posts."

As in elementary and secondary education, statistics for higher education indicate that the mean salaries of men continued to exceed the mean salaries of women at every academic rank and at every institutional level both in publicly and privately controlled institutions. For faculty members, mean salaries differed by $3,848 in public institutions and by $3,708 in private institutions. Of 950 respondents in a National Education Association study in 1973, the 32 women presidents had a median salary of $25,214; the 918 men presidents had a median salary of $29,932.

Leadership Positions at Federal and State Levels

Women find themselves in pretty much the same circumstances whether in academe or meshed into the State and Federal layers of education. Only four chief State school officers are female (Arizona, Nebraska, Montana, and Wisconsin), and in 1972, no State deputy commissioner or assistant commissioner was female.

At the time this was written, of the full-time professional staff in the Office of Education and the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, women held 1 of 6 grade 18 positions; 1 of 13 grade 17 slots; 3 of 35 grade 16 jobs; 23 of 158 grade 15 positions and 57 of 301 grade 14 jobs. The average grade for women in the Office of Education is 7; the average grade for men is 14.

Most of the written material on women in administration deals with the lack of women in "leverage" posts. They make up only about 20 percent of school board membership, only 13 percent of all college trustees, and only 8 percent of the trustees of 4-year coeducation colleges and universities.

If educational administration is to be fair on a basis of sex, women need greater access to administrative jobs at all levels, particularly those at the top. This could be brought about by affording women the same opportunity to ascend the educational career ladder in the same length of time and with the same ease as men. The promotion of a few women to key positions does not help the access of women generally to positions of leadership. It merely facilitates the access of the specific women who are promoted, and it triggers a host of detrimental side effects. For one, it jeopardizes the chance for success of these women because they are left alone in the system to combat all the factors that have traditionally impeded their access to these positions: attitudinal barriers, socialization factors, discriminatory hiring criteria, and inadequate management skills.

Attitudinal Barriers

Women who aspire to leadership positions are directly competing with men. Some men feel threatened by this and fear they will lose jobs and job opportunities to female applicants. Their reasoning is as follows: Educational institutions, in an effort to comply with Title IX, will implement employment policies of "reverse discrimination," and as the pool of women applicants for administrative positions increases in size, women will be hired instead of men.

In *Antibias Regulations of Universities: Faculty Problems and Their Solutions*, Richard Lester articulates the fears of a number of people, contending that affirmative action is detrimental to education. He argues that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has overestimated the degree of discrimination against women in higher education, and as a result pressure is built for reverse discrimination in an attempt to meet inflated equal employment goals. Since, he contends, in certain fields there are not many qualified women, Mr. Lester fears that universities will hire women in these fields no matter what their level of competence. He goes on to cite, as an example of the dearth of qualified women, the fact that, in the field of engineering, women hold less than 1 percent of the doctoral degrees.

In her critique of Mr. Lester's report, Bernice Sandler reveals that the "National Academy of Sciences reports that the unemployment rate of women with doctorates in science, engineering, and social sciences is more than four times as high as the unemployment rate of their male colleagues." She argues against the contention that "unqualified women are invading the tenured ranks," pointing out that not only is preferential hiring of women *not* a prevalent practice, but of the few women who are hired, most are hired at the lower ranks.

In any event, the law does not require that women be preferred; it requires that women be given equal opportunity. Ms. Sandler states that the law has three requirements: a genuine effort to recruit women and minorities, specification of job-related criteria before the hiring process, and equal application to women and minorities of whatever criteria are set for white men.

Educators do not, then, have to hire people with lower qualifications. Through misinterpretation of the law, they may in fact do so, but they are not required to have a policy of reverse discrimination. Affirmative action plans should increase rather than decrease the caliber of education because its objective is to facilitate access to all qualified applicants, regardless of race or gender. A first step, therefore, is to increase the applicant pool.

It is true that, if job competition increases, less qualified white males will not be hired when an employer or committee finds that a female or minority applicant is more qualified for the job. White males may well resent the competition of women and minorities in a job market that is already tight. But education, like private industry, has every right and should feel obliged to hire the most qualified applicant, regardless of race or gender.

Socialization Factors

Women are not socialized to have high career expectations, with the effect that, unlike most men, they are ambivalent about their professional ambitions. Those who do aspire to leadership positions often find it difficult to fit this priority into their own value system. When discouraged by external factors, they wonder if they are right in pursuing leadership positions, revealing a lack of confidence that a man's internalized value system provides him. In some ways, then, women need more support than men from peers, supervisors, and subordinates because many women are unable to reconcile their ambitions and their values, induced by parents, teachers, and colleagues. In other words, the absence of external support may have a greater effect on a woman than on a man because men are socialized to persevere and seek professional success while women are not.

Many women may be reluctant to pursue jobs in which they know they will not be able to benefit from the same kinds of support systems and rewards as their male colleagues. According to Rosabeth Moss Kanter, a sociology professor at Yale, "Peer relations affect a woman's decision not to seek promotion into managerial ranks, where she will no longer be part of a group of women; for men, of course, peer relations are a given [factor] throughout managerial ranks." But a woman administrator gives up more than the camaraderie of female co-workers. She must also gain access without the professional support that men receive from one another. This is a real concern in the field of education, where men enjoy the benefits of the "old boy" system, an informal network through which men provide information to colleagues and mentorship to younger male aspirants. The "old boy" network is not open to women and consequently unless a woman is singularly well connected, she will not receive the job information that normally flows through the network. It is often true that qualified women are not recommended unless an institution specifies that it wants women candidates.

In schools of education administration only 2 percent of the faculty are women, hardly enough to provide the support and encouragement that females need. A study of the University of Chicago graduate school found that it provided the female students with a "null environment," the conclusion being that in most graduate schools of consequence women are admitted but thereafter barely tolerated, and that this "null environment" contributed to less successful graduate careers for women and lowered their expectations and aspirations toward postgraduate employment.

Because there are not enough successful women to provide mentorship to young aspiring women, the job falls to men willing to do it. Yet mentorship provided by men does not completely erase the handicap brought about by the lack of women in positions of educational administration. For who, other than a woman, can better serve as a role model for another woman?

The lack of societal support for women aspiring to leadership positions limits the access of women in three ways: First, the system directly restricts the visibility of qualified women; second, it denies women the possibility of gaining support and confidence from other women; and third, it reminds women that should they gain job access they will still not have the same support that men have.

Further effects of socialization include the ways in which sex-role stereotypes interfere with how men and women perceive the status, role, and spheres of influence of a woman in a power situation. The premise that men tend to judge women's performance in jobs in terms of their behavior rather than by their successful completion of the task is documented in a study by researcher Martha Kent. She interviewed hundreds of female graduate students over several years in an effort to understand the kind of comments they received from colleagues and male superiors. She concluded that women receive from men a disproportionate amount of "person-centered feedback," both positive and negative. That is to say, in place of comments about work done or "task-centered feedback," a woman will be told she is a good—or a difficult—person to work with. Person-centered feedback, Ms. Kent notes, is considered inappropriate and destructive to the development of internal standards in the profession. It is better to say, "This job was sloppily done," rather than, "You are a sloppy person."

Jean Lipman-Blumen, sociology researcher at the National Institute of Education, points out that women are socialized to choose the path of indirect or vicarious achievement rather than that of direct achievement. They are supposed to experience achievement and satisfaction through an alliance with a "significant other," their interactions with this "other" being of a supportive nature. If a woman breaks away from this stereotype, she is labeled as deviant and asexual.

A strong leader cannot have this vicarious orientation exclusively. Therefore, if a woman cooperates with the stereotype, it is at the cost of her administrative effectiveness. Good leaders need both a direct and vicarious achievement style. Men tend to display only the direct style, which fits with present organizational norms, but they would profit from the use of the indirect style as much as women would benefit from the use of the direct style. It is important to the success of women that they retain an appreciation of indirect achievement while acquiring a knack for direct achievement.

Ms. Kanter contends that women are pressured to conform to a picture of womanhood while performing as competent professionals. Since many women feel they will be rejected if they seem overly competent, they hesitate to assume the leadership role even if they are in the official leadership position. Moreover, even when a woman administrator or manager has authority, she may find that she is not accepted as a leader by her subordinates, male or female. This serves to reinforce any ambivalence toward the power of the female administrator, for women are consistently reinforced only for those behaviors that are congruent with sex-role stereotypes.

Discriminatory Hiring Criteria

Even if a woman has the ambition and confidence to pursue a leadership position in spite of the absence of support from others, she still must overcome sexist hiring criteria. In a study of 235 business students who reviewed job applications, it was found that all else being equal, males were evaluated more favorably on general job suitability than females. The same study also indicated that the more demanding a position seemed to be, the more likely it was that women would be given low evaluations and rejected for the job. The résumés with female names were rated significantly lower on "technical potential," "potential for long service to the organization," and potential "for fitting in well." This finding would seem to account for a 1970 statistic that said female school administrators in North Carolina were more intelligent than 91.8 percent of the general population, the indication being that in order to gain entry into a leadership position, a woman must be far more qualified than her male competitors.

Successful women have two alternative means of access, however. The first is to take advantage of every good connection that friendship or kinship provides. Of course, men have this option too. But it appears that in the past many successful women owed their entry level job to a friend, relative, or husband. A second alternative presents itself to women who find male mentors. Often these men, when promoted, take their proteges with them to better opportunities. This is a risky career path, obviously, since it means that the woman's success is dependent on that of her mentor.

Inadequate Management Skills

For reasons related to socialization, women are less likely than men to have pursued training directly for administration. For many women in administrative and managerial positions, however, it is not their lack of management skills that hinder their success but rather their inability to recognize that they have these skills. Since women are not rewarded on the basis of leadership skills, they have no means for judging how many of these skills they actually possess or which of the strategies they employ are the most effective. But the lack of specific training in management skills also means that women will allow themselves to be evaluated in their interpersonal rather than their administrative skills. Mid-career training would probably do a great deal toward alleviating this situation.

Strategies for Change

A comprehensive strategy to bring more closely to balance the proportion of women and men administrators at all levels must focus on the major barriers women encounter in aspiring to careers in educational leadership. These have been identified as attitudinal barriers, socialization factors, discriminatory hiring criteria, and inadequate management skills. The following areas emphasize components of a systematic effort to break down and eliminate those barriers which deter women.

- *Vocational Counseling and Career Guidance Services for Women Students.* Women and men students need better guidance and counseling services throughout their educational careers and stand to benefit more from services that are based on current and nonsexist information and materials. Utmost attention must be given to developing nonsexist materials that advance women toward career options associated with their own skills and interests rather than sex-role stereotypes. Training for counselors serving women students is needed to guarantee that capable women are encouraged toward rather than dissuaded from aspiring to administrative and managerial careers.

- *Access, Visibility, and Networking.* Increased mentorship experiences are needed to facilitate and maintain access to career advancement opportunities for women. Benefits include greater professional visibility for women, access to local networks and contacts for information about jobs and career options, and opportunity for aspiring women administrators to develop their own support systems.

Professional visibility means taking a dominant or authoritative role in a professional situation and thereby becoming a focus of attention. Women in education can become visible by volunteering for committees within their own school or university and by taking an active part in professional associations. By making the most of these opportunities, women can gain management skills, develop self-confidence, and overcome barriers to visibility, access, and career development.

- *Training and Support Services.* Many excellent institute models currently exist for developing skills and personal traits of aspiring women administrators. During the next 2 years many more training modules will be developed with Federal Women's Educational Equity Act moneys. It is hoped that many of these modules will address the particular training needs of mid-career women who have managerial skill through related work experiences but who lack expertise in career planning, placement, and other areas. In addition, women should seek out opportunities to diagnose their potential for managerial positions and apply their administrative skills to career advancement.

Formal and informal support systems can serve a variety of functions for aspiring women educational leaders. Until women are better represented in educational leadership positions, support systems are needed to help them overcome the psychological, attitudinal, socialization, and other barriers they face in male-dominated societies.

- *Enforcement of Federal Regulations and Legislation.* Careful, deliberate, and persistent effort must be maintained to assure systematic compliance with all Federal and State statutes that apply to hiring and promotion practices. Discriminatory practices in hiring or promotional opportunities that deter women's career advancement must be vigorously challenged through the court system. Class-action suits and funding cut-offs by Federal agencies are two ways of forcing school districts and higher-education institutions to comply with these statutes. The Federal Government must take an aggressive posture to guarantee women's Constitutional rights.

With the establishment and assiduous operation of these strategies, it is hard to see how the barriers that have thus far blocked women from attaining their rightful place in educational leadership can endure. That the task of battering them down is a just and proper one there can be no question. The question is: How long must justice wait? ●

TEACHER EDUCATION: A NEW SET OF GOALS

by Shirley McCune, Martha Matthews, and Janice Earle

With the passage of Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments, elimination of sex discrimination and sex-role stereotyping became not only a matter of sound educational policy and practice, but also a matter of compliance with Federal law. Institutions that train education personnel shoulder a double burden under this law: They must not only assure their own compliance with Title IX, but they must also prepare students to provide the leadership and technical capability necessary for the implementation of Title IX and the attainment of sexual equality. By the very nature of the functions they perform, these institutions impinge directly on or affect indirectly a large number of the people who provide educational services as well as the students in training for professional roles. These functions include:

- —the preparation of school personnel for professional positions in the staffing of schools and educational institutions,
- —the provision of a major resource for the research and investigation of professional issues related to education,
- —the determination of the changing body of knowledge and technology that is relevant to education,
- —the development of programs or curriculums for use in schools, and
- —the provision of a major source of continuing inservice education for educational practitioners.

There is evidence to suggest that teacher education has functioned to model and perpetuate stereotyped expectations and roles rather than to assume leadership for educational change. Sex stereotyping and sex discrimination are evident in the in-

---

The authors are on the staff of the Resource Center on Sex Roles in Education, National Foundation for the Improvement of Education.

stitutional structures, the curriculum, the research and development efforts, and the behavior of faculty and administrators within these institutions. In institutional structures, for example, sex discrimination is often reflected in the employment patterns. Data obtained from 208 responses to a 1974 questionnaire mailed to 1,100 departments or schools of education indicated that in those institutions responding, 73 percent of all tenured faculty were males. A further indication of sex typing within education facilities is that females are most frequently represented in areas such as human development or curriculum, while males are the strong majority in educational administration, educational research, and educational philosophy.

In the matter of curriculum, more than 5,000 courses in women's studies were offered in institutions of higher education in 1975, yet surveys indicated that only 184 courses—offered in 94 institutions—relating to women's studies on sex-role stereotyping could be identified in schools or departments of education from 1973 to 1975. This general lack of awareness of the issues of sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination is further demonstrated in the "Standards for Accreditation of Teacher Education." The 540 accredited institutions account for the preparation of 82 percent of the teachers and a majority of the counselors and administrators who graduate from institutions of higher education each year. Although the proposed revision of standards represents a substantial improvement in earlier standards by recognizing the values of diverse cultural groups and need for educational programs that include the general principles of multicultural education, there is not a single reference to the need for attention to sex-role socialization and sex discrimination in educational programs.

In research and development, the third set of evidence of discrimination, institutions of higher education frequently operate apart from practitioners, and their research and development efforts often reflect this isolation. A review of the content of doctoral dissertation titles in the field of education revealed that 52 dissertations completed in 1975–76 deal with issues rated to sex-role stereotyping, whereas 96 such dissertations were carried out in the field of psychology. While this demonstrates a growing attention to research that delineates the nature of sex-role socialization and its individual and societal outcomes, it raises a question about the amount of such research that is being carried out in schools and departments of education. Among other neglects, research and development efforts have, for the most part, failed to include the investigation of issues or the development of products that relate to sex-role socialization, sex-role stereotyping, or sex discrimination. Seldom have education faculty members encouraged and supported student research and development in these areas. The cumulative effect of multiple investigations initiated and supported by faculty could make a substantial contribution to a relevant issue facing practitioners and the larger society.

Finally, education faculties, like all groups in our society, have been socialized both personally and professionally on the basis of sexist assumptions and values. Their beliefs regarding appropriate roles and behaviors for members of each sex affect not only their own behaviors and careers but also those of students. Schools and departments of education, like higher education in general, make little provision for the systematic inservice development of their faculty. As a result, many faculty members remain unaware of their part in the perpetuation of sex-role stereotyping as they conduct classes, engage in research, and influence departmental policies and practices.

Attainment of nonsexist teacher education will require working toward a set of clearly stated goals:

(1) To instruct students in how cultural and sexual identities influence the growth and development of individuals.

(2) To give students a basis for appreciation of multicultural (includes racial-ethnic cultures and sex-role cultures) identity and diversity as factors to be considered in the organization of educational institutions and services.

(3) To elucidate the general principles relating to educational equity and the specific issues of sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination in education.

(4) To clarify the specific requirements of the Title IX regulation and other Federal and State nondiscrimination laws.

(5) To provide students with the knowledge and skills for the identification and correction of discriminatory policies, practices, and programs.

(6) To extend curriculum into areas such as nonsexist, interpersonal relationship skills; nonracist, nonsexist curriculum de-

velopment; equal employment personnel management; and development and implementation of strategies and technology for achieving equity in education—for example, affirmative action, grievance handling, and institutional self-evaluation.

Some of the actions that administrators and organizations can take to attain these goals are:

Deans of Education

(1) Review existing curriculum to ensure provision of information and experiences that would achieve the goals of nonsexist education and the correction of areas of omission or bias. This could be carried out through formation of faculty-student task forces; development of guidelines for faculty to create and establish nonsexist programs; identification of cross-disciplinary resources and programs for curriculum revision and enrichment; identification of areas for research and development related to issues of sex-role socialization, sexism in education, and sex discrimination which could be used for student and faculty research efforts; and development of cross departmental and practitioner sharing of expertise in research, methods, and practice related to sex-role socialization.

(2) Development of a capability to conduct inservice training programs on sexism in education for practitioners.

(3) Development and incorporation of research and training efforts that could delineate and remediate those forms of sex bias found in teacher behaviors and educational practice.

(4) Full implementation of an institutional self-evaluation to determine overt and covert forms of bias and the development of corrective actions.

(5) Development of programs that could provide education and training for faculty members.

National and Regional Accreditation Agencies

(1) Develop and include accreditation standards requiring content and experiences related to sex-role socialization, sex-role stereotyping, and sex discrimination.

(2) Develop evaluation criteria for the review of teacher-education programs to ensure consideration of equity concerns in accreditation review.

(3) Develop policies requiring that accreditation-review teams include persons with expertise in the area of sex-role stereotyping and its manifestation in education.

(4) Develop and include in accreditation standards criteria for the provision of equal-opportunity employment in departmental policies and practices.

Federal Agencies

(1) Support research and development of guidelines to modify accreditation and certification standards, so as to include requirements for education content relating to sex-role socialization and sex-role stereotyping.

(2) Support the development of a competency-based multicultural curriculum model that would provide methods for affirming sex roles in various cultures.

(3) Support models that could increase the knowledge and skills of all faculty members and prepare them for a variety of career roles in education.

(4) Support the development of a major curriculum study and of guidelines and materials that reflect changing knowledge, changing methodologies, and multicultural concepts.

State Education Agencies

(1) Develop accreditation and certification guidelines that require course content dealing with sex-role socialization, sex-role stereotyping, and their subsequent implications for educational practice.

(2) Develop workshops, conferences, and collaborative projects for faculty of higher-education institutions which assist understanding and implementation of women's equity.

(3) Develop regulations and guidelines that include multicultural and sex-role education issues for renewal of professional certificates.

(4) Sponsor educational programs and conferences on multicultural concerns and the technology for achieving educational equity.

(5) Develop training models for use by local education agencies in inservice training.

(6) Develop policies ensuring that state standards boards include representation of practitioners and persons with expertise in sex-role stereotyping and sex discrimination. ●

WORK, WOMEN, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

by Corinne H. Rieder

Most of the 37 million women who are now working in the United States are occupationally segregated. That is to say, they are victimized by covert discrimination, often unintentional, and by socialization practices that effectively limit their careers. What's more, 1.2 million women who will join them this year will enter the same low-pay, low-status jobs that women have traditionally held. In addressing this issue, a fair question would be: Do vocational-education programs contribute to this job and pay segregation? If indeed they do, a further question must be answered: What can be done about it?

The struggle for equity for women in work and training should not be confused with some of the more inflammatory and highly publicized aspects of the feminist movement. Although it may lack the theatrics to win headlines, that struggle is the essence of the movement and a revolution in American society. Any discussion of women and work must begin with the extraordinary and largely unforeseen number of women entering the work force.

In the first 40 years of this century, the labor-force-participation rate of women rose slowly from 20 percent in 1900 to 29 percent in 1940. This situation changed dramatically when, after America entered World War II, women replaced men in many traditionally all-male occupations. Instead of declining after the war, women's entry into the labor market accelerated. In the 25-year period between 1949 and 1974, the number of American women who worked for pay outside the home more than doubled and they continue to enter the labor force at an extraordinary rate, making up 33 percent of the national work force in 1960, 38 percent in 1970, and more than 40 percent in

---

Ms. Rieder is Associate Director for Education and Work at the National Institute of Education.

1976, a figure they were not expected to reach until 1985, according to U.S. Labor Department forecasts made as recently as three years ago. Economists are now saying that half of American women over 16 will be in the work force within 2 or 3 years.

Eli Ginsberg, chairman of the National Commission for Manpower Policy, has gone so far as to call the increase of women in the work force "the single most outstanding phenomenon of our century" and to add that "its long-term implications are absolutely unchartable. . . . It will affect women, men, and children, and the cumulative consequences of that will only be revealed in the 21st and 22nd centuries."

There are many factors accounting for this increase of women in the work force. Among them are the availability of jobs, particularly in those rapidly growing fields—sales, clerical, service—where there is a preponderance of women; the rising divorce rates, the declining birth rates, and later marriages; the increasing number of women who are educated, particularly female college graduates who want to pursue careers; the high inflation rate which makes a second income necessary for a family to survive or to maintain a standard of living; and finally, the women's movement, which has raised social consciousness, made working for pay outside the home more socially acceptable for mothers, and fostered the view that through work women can find additional intellectual and personal fulfillment.

Despite the gains in the number of women employed, the patterns of job segregation that confine women to the traditionally "female" occupations have not changed. Whether one examines specific occupations, occupational groups, or concentration by industry, women are less well distributed in the work force than men. To illustrate, more than 40 percent of all women in the work force are employed in 10 occupations: secretary, retail sales clerk, bookkeeper, private household worker, elementary-school teacher, waitress, typist, cashier, nurse, and seamstress. By comparison, only 20 percent of males are concentrated in the 10 largest occupations employing men.

The occupational segregation of women is also evident in comparing men and women by occupational groups. Nearly 70 percent of women are employed in three occupational groups: clerical (35 percent), service (18 percent), and professional and technical (15 percent). Only 50 percent of men are employed in the largest three occupational groups employing men: skilled crafts (21 percent), professional and technical (14 percent), and managers (14 percent).

Finally, occupational segregation by sex also exists by industries. Sixty-three percent of all women employed in nonagricultural positions are concentrated in services (25 percent), retail (20 percent), and State and local government (18 percent, largely teachers). In comparison, 45 percent of men are concentrated in the three largest industries employing men: manufacturing (19 percent), retail (14 percent), and State and local government (12 percent).

Within occupations, women are also segregated. In medicine, they are overrepresented in pediatrics, psychiatry, anesthesiology, and pathology but grossly underrepresented in surgery and surgical specialties. In addition, they are less likely than men to be in private practice and particularly in private solo practice. In law few women are in the upper echelons of law firms, on judicial benches, or in prominent positions in State and national legislatures. And in education, women account for nearly 85 percent of the Nation's elementary teachers but less than 50 percent of secondary teachers and only 25 percent of college-level teachers. In school administration, the figures are even more striking. Here women account for only 19 percent of all elementary principals, 1 percent of secondary principals, and only one-tenth of 1 percent of school superintendents. Today there are only 150 women who are chief executives of colleges, mostly 2-year and 4-year church-related colleges with small enrollments. Outside education, nearly 1 out of 7 men are in managerial and administrative positions; the comparable ratio for women is 1 out of 20.

The result of women's occupational segregation in the labor market is low wages. This occurs even in the fastest growing industries. For example, women who work full time had median weekly earnings of $124 in 1974. This is about 60 percent of the $204 reported for men. In fact, during the last few years the difference in earnings between men and women widened slightly. Across industries, female earnings as a percentage of male earnings are best in agriculture (83 percent) and public administration (71 percent). They are worst in finance, insurance, and real estate (56 percent), and in manufacturing (57 percent).

Even the economic return associated with greater educational attainment is substantially less for women than for men. In 1974 the median income for a female college graduate who worked full time was $9,771; for men, median earnings were $16,576.

Low wages for women hurt not only women but also children and men. First, women work because of economic need just as men do. Sixty-seven percent of working women are either single, divorced, widowed, separated, or have husbands who earn less than $7,000 per year. In many instances the earnings of wives make the difference between a middle or a low standard of living.

Divorce and separation are increasing in our society, and the final impact is often severe. Only 50 percent of women in divorce actions receive alimony or child support. For those, the median total payment is $1,300 per year. The median annual wage for a female-headed family is only $5,116 and nearly 33 percent of such families have incomes below the poverty line. For minorities the problems are even more severe, and more than half of all families headed by a minority woman have incomes below the poverty level. A General Accounting Office report recently found that the combined average monthly income of women and children receiving both welfare and earned income in 1975 was less than $300 a month; the median income of the man who abandoned them was about $800 a month.

The concentration of women in traditional female occupations is barely changing. In the 10-year period between 1960 and 1970, the number of women in the skilled trades—a matter of utmost importance to vocational educators—increased by 218,000 (from 277,000 to 495,000). In specific trades, the female share of employment increased as follows: for carpenters, from 0.4 to 1.3 percent; for electricians, from 0.7 to 1.8 percent; for plumbers, from 0. to 1.1 percent; for auto mechanics, from 0.4 to 1.4 percent; for painters, from 1.9 to 4.1 percent; for tool- and diemakers, from 0.6 to 2.1 percent; and for machinists, from 1.3 to 3.1 percent. In the health professions, by way of comparison, the proportion of women physicians rose from 7 to 9 percent and women dentists increased from 2.3 to 3.4 percent.

When measured as a rate of increase, women's entry into nontraditional occupations showed impressive growth. For example, the number of women carpenters quadrupled in the decade 1960–70. This rate of growth is encouraging, but the absolute numbers of women in such occupations are so small that it remains to be seen if such growth rates can continue in the future. For the most part women keep crowding the clerical and service fields, and over the next decade projections indicate that two-thirds of the total increase in employment of women will take place in those traditionally female occupations.

Because vocational-education enrollments faithfully mirror the occupational segregation by sex in the labor force, it may be inferred that vocational education has done little to eliminate occupational segregation. Although women make up 55 percent (6.4 million) of the 11.6 million students enrolled in federally funded vocational education and two-thirds of all secondary vocational enrollments, they are heavily concentrated in home economics (leading mainly to unpaid homemaking roles) and in office and health occupations. For example, about 45 percent of the women receiving vocational education in 1972 were enrolled in consumer and homemaking classes, and women constituted 92 percent of all enrollees in these programs. Twenty-eight percent of all women vocational students were taking training leading to office occupations, and again they made up a substantial percentage (84.7) of all enrollees in such programs.

Conversely, women are underrepresented in trade, industrial, and technical education. In trade and industrial occupations, they make up less than 12 percent of total enrollments and even then they are heavily concentrated in such traditionally female fields as cosmetology, textile production and fabrication, commercial and graphic arts, public services, and supervisory training. In technical occupations, less than 10 percent of the total enrollment is female, and in only one occupational title—scientific data technology—do women make up more than 30 percent of total enrollments.

Thus almost all the women in vocational education are concentrated in a few traditional programs. Change has been slow, but the changes are interesting to review: Between 1969 and 1973, a few women began to enroll in traditionally "male" vocational programs. Although the number of women enrolled in these programs was small, the increase was significant. In air-conditioning courses the number of women enrollees went from 70 to 2,664; in auto body and fender repair, from 7 to 1,082; in auto mechanics, from 906 to 5,299; in carpentry, from 111 to 1,451; in metal occupations, from 1,367 to 3,081; in law-enforcement training, 2,225 to 5,943, and in woodworking occupations, from 592 to 5,373.

Ending occupational sex-role stereotyping and segregation is most certainly in the national interest. Consider the loss to the country when one-half of the population is unable to make a full contribution to the general economic, political, and social welfare because of occupational sex-role stereotyping. By limiting male roles and female roles, men as well as women are affected. If sex-role stereotyping were eliminated, many more service and white-collar opportunities would be open to men. Why shouldn't it be considered appropriate for a man to be an elementary-school teacher, a clerk typist, or a nurse, and for a woman to be a bus driver or a skilled craft worker?

Eliminating the "overcrowding" of women in a narrow band of occupations would tend to equalize incomes between men and women. And that could be an advantage to both sexes. The recent recession brought home to many men firsthand what it was like to have to live on their wives' income. As men were laid off, they began to look more seriously at their wives' low-income and to question why it was so low.

Vocational educators, as much as any other single group in our society, have both the responsibility and the means to do something about these problems. They are at the critical juncture between school and work; they recruit students, provide them with the knowledge and skills needed for successful job entry, and place them in their first jobs. Their responsibility is to represent the utilitarian purposes of education and to meet society's economic needs. Within the world of work, they are concerned with developing their students' potential to the fullest and placing students in a work environment that is financially and psychologically rewarding. They must stand in the first rank in the battle against occupational and educational segregation.

Vocational educators can take six steps toward combating sex-role stereotyping and occupational segregation. First, they can implement fully the vocational-education section of the

Education Amendments of 1976. The Act is unequivocal on the problem of sex bias in vocational education, calling for the assignment of full-time personnel who will: create greater awareness of vocational-education programs and activities that reduce sex stereotyping; gather, analyze, and disseminate data on the status of male and female students and employees; review the distribution of grants by the state boards to ensure that women's needs are being met; review vocational programs for sex bias; monitor all personnel laws prohibiting discrimination; review and submit recommendations in the annual program plan and report; and provide assistance to local-education agencies or other bodies in overcoming sex stereotyping and sex bias.

Clearly, the provisions of this law cannot be fulfilled by lip-service, nor do they invite merely an imposition of still another layer of bureaucracy. The Act is a charter and a mandate under which vocational educators can set their house in order with support and information from higher levels of government.

As a second step vocational educators can change recruitment and admission practices and policies. Over the next few years, the Office of Civil Rights in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will be carefully examining enrollments in vocational schools, courses, and programs. It will be joined by the Lawyer's Committee for Equal Rights Under the Law, funded by the Carnegie and Ford Foundations, which will be looking at the same problem. Recruitment policies—where and how prospective students are recruited—will most likely be a special focus of these investigations.

A third effort vocational educators can make is toward improving guidance and counseling efforts. Counselors have a particularly important role. They can either reinforce sex-role stereotypes that narrow occupational choices or they can encourage students to think more broadly about their educational and occupational decisions. For example, standardized tests, particularly career-interest inventories, should be interpreted in ways that are fair to both sexes and used as tools to expand the career possibilities explored by both girls and boys. Counselors will be made aware of these problems and of the ways they can bring about change only through inservice and preservice training.

The education and work group of the National Institute of Education has funded the development of many excellent materials that are now available for such training, including *Sex Fairness in Career Guidance: A Learning Kit, New Career Options for Women: A Counselor's Sourcebook,* and two films with teacher's and students' guides.

Fourth, vocational educators can revise curricular materials and teaching practices. An NIE-funded study found that most career-education materials examined were sex-biased. The Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, the contractor for this study, developed a simple checklist to assess sex bias and some specific ways to counter it. The checklist is available from the Educational Products Information Exchange Institute, 463 West Street, New York, NY 10014.

A fifth strategy would be to increase the number of female vocational administrators and qualified women teachers in male-dominated courses and male teachers in female-dominated fields. Although women faculty dominate the traditionally female vocational subjects, they are all but absent in other vocational programs—agricultural, technical, trade, and industrial. At administrative levels, women are present in only token numbers. There is only one woman State director of vocational education. Fewer than 20 percent of the national and State vocational education advisory council members are women. Training and placement programs need to be mounted immediately to increase the pool of qualified women and to see that they are placed in teaching and administrative positions commensurate with their skills and experience. The development of such programs should be a major role for the new National Center for Vocational Education.

Finally, vocational educators can continue important research and development efforts on women in vocational education. Continued research and development is sorely needed not only on the problems facing women in choosing and entering careers and in progressing in them, but also on interventions that will ease their transition from school to work and make more successful their later labor-market experiences. Four specific areas need immediate attention. One is the impact of working women on family life. As women take an equal share of the high-paying jobs, two questions will demand answers:

Will the income difference between poor and better-off families increase? Will male unemployment increase? Studies will also be needed on nonprofessional women who make up over 80 percent of women in the labor force. Since the 1920s, research in this field has declined to a point where in recent years there has not been a single book devoted to the social and economic problems of these women.

A third subject that needs more research is avocational interests, which, studies already suggest, can be important to people's career choices. Vocational educators should be working with elementary and junior high-school students in the schools and through youth groups (4H, YMCA and YWCA, Girl and Boy Scouts) to broaden and deepen the opportunities to explore nontraditional roles. Boys in particular need to feel more comfortable in helping roles, while much work needs to be done in encouraging girls to assume leadership positions and better use their mechanical and technical aptitudes. Further, vocational educators need to work more closely with parents to inform them of trade and technical job opportunities so that they will not inadvertently discourage their youngsters from pursuing nontraditional avocational and vocational interests.

Since vocational educators are directly concerned with the educational goal of preparing individuals for work, they have an obligation to work toward eliminating the negative effects of practices in the home and early school that lock individuals into traditional male or female stereotyped occupational roles. Their efforts should also be extended against those policies and practices of the work community which overtly or covertly discriminate against either sex.

One NIE response to intervening in the socialization process is a new children's television series, now under development at the public television station in Los Angeles. The series, aimed at children in grades 4–6 and their parents and teachers, is intended to reduce the limiting effect that sex roles may have on the development of interests and preferences, which in turn affect educational and occupational decisions.

Vocational educators should also take the lead in expanding cooperative relationships with unions and employers in order to help women find jobs and take part in exploring career possibilities, especially in nontraditional fields.

A third way vocational educators can intervene is by exercising leadership. They could take the lead in prodding Federal, State, and local officials to engage in public discussion of important issues relevant to the social revolution now taking place. They could, for instance, support the establishment of a National Commission on Women and Work, which would place special emphasis on the needs and aspirations of America's nonprofessional female worker—the clerk, the saleswoman, and the service and blue-collar woman—those who make up over 80 percent of working women.

One reason for such a national commission is that these women, who are vocational education's constituency, have largely been ignored in most public discussions on the role of women today. The focus during the last decade has almost exclusively been on the middle-class, upwardly mobile educated woman. The voice of women's liberation was her voice and spoke of her need to fulfill herself, to compete and to succeed in a man's world. These voices broke the barriers by writing the books, making the speeches, filming the shows, and editing the magazines that have made her middle-class male counterpart begin to understand her needs and ambitions.

It is time for the voice of her less educated sister to be heard. Although a national commission is no panacea and lacks the luster of a presentation like *Roots,* it can generate public awareness of the nonprofessional, working woman's plight; it can stimulate legislative and administrative initiatives that address her special problems; it can identify research and development activities that might help her break out of existing patterns of job stereotyping and improve her own self-image.

The most important and difficult single barrier in eliminating sex stereotyping and segregation is attitude. Most women and men have at one time or another believed that there are occupations that should be held by only one sex, that women are inherently less competent than men, that women cannot successfully supervise men or other women, that if women with young children go to work the family will inevitably disintegrate.

Fifteen years ago the civil-rights movement faced similar attitudinal barriers in the struggle for equity under the law. Those barriers by and large have been toppled, revealing how flimsy and meaningless they were and how impotent against the forces of learning, living, and working. Dare women hope that the attitudinal barriers to their equity are similarly vulnerable?

President Carter told the United Nations General Assembly: "The basic thrust of human affairs points toward a more universal demand for fundamental human rights. The United States has a historical birthright to be associated with this process."

Certainly sex fairness is a fundamental human right. ●

ENLARGING THE AMERICAN DREAM

by Donna Hart

Traditionally, American society has been willing to accept culturally different peoples if they in turn were willing to reject their cultural distinctiveness. Assimilation, until the late 1960s, was accepted by almost everyone, educators and large segments of most ethnic communities prominently included. During the past decade, however, an emerging sense of heritage that is being more and more proudly expressed by racial minority and national origin groups is changing all this.

The past definition of education's function—to remodel citizens for conformity to a single homogeneous model of acceptable behavior and beliefs—is being challenged. Many Americans now contend that democratic education should have cultural pluralism as a goal. They argue that the rich cultural mix in America—the different values, customs, traditions, and religions—can expand everyone's horizons as it affects all aspects of life, including sex-role attitudes and issues of concern in education.

This article presents an overview of the impact of the women's movement on cultural norms and heritage and the cultural differences and educational experiences of five minority groups—Puerto Rican, Chicano, Black, Asian, and Native American. Though these five groups by no means represent all minority women, they do indicate the needs of a major seg-

---

Ms. Hart is on the faculty of the School of Education, George Washington University. The following reviewed drafts of the issue paper from which this article was taken: Cecilia Preciado-Burciaga assistant for Chicano Affairs, Stanford; Francelia Gleaves, Project on Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges; Edith Thomas Harvey, director of Equal Education, Nebraska Department of Education; Pat Locke and Paquito Vivo, directors of Ethnic Studies, Western Interstate Commission of Higher Education; Jeanie Myerson and Beverly Orr, staff writers, National Project on Women's Education.

ment of minority women as they differ from the needs of Anglo women.

Black Women

Black women, victims of double discrimination because of their race and sex, are often asked to make a choice with regard to their priorities: "Are you black first, or female first?" The plain fact is that they are both and have no way to separate the two. Many black women believe that the effort to *force* a separation of the two, especially as that relates to establishment of society priorities, has worked to the detriment of both the racial movement and the women's movement. The black woman is the victim of both racism and sexism, and therefore represents a potentially powerful unifying force around issues for both movements.

In a piece included in *Voices of the New Feminism,* writer Pauli Murray says, "Because black women have an equal stake in women's liberation and black liberation, they are key figures at the juncture of these two movements. White women feminists are their natural allies in both cases. Their own liberation is linked with the issues that are stirring women today: adequate income maintenance and the elimination of poverty, repeal or reform of abortion laws, a national system of child-care centers, extension of labor standards to workers now excluded, cash maternity benefits as part of a system of social insurance, and the removal of all sex barriers to educational and employment opportunities at all levels. Black women have a special stake in the revolt against the treatment of women primarily as sex objects, for their own history has left them with the scars of the most brutal and degrading aspects of sexual exploitation."

The notion that the black female enjoys a favored economic position in relation to the male is a myth. The belief that black women have always been "liberated," and therefore do not need to be involved in a movement to liberate women is also a myth. The media-produced stereotype of the women's movement as a middle-class white women's struggle to escape from housework and child rearing, to get out of her home and into the job market ignores the black woman who may have been a family breadwinner but who lacked the opportunity to make free choices concerning her life.

Historically, these "breadwinner" jobs have been the result of the economic structure's need for cheap labor. Because of an economic necessity of earning a living to help support the family and a need for the black community to draw heavily upon the resources of all its members in order to survive, black women have taken jobs that few others would accept; thereby they unwittingly aided in creating the myth of the female's dominance in the black family. This illustrates how racism has affected the relationships between black males and females. As black men develop access to the economic power structure, black women for the first time have wife or worker options that many white women have had for a long time.

Diane Slaughter of the University of Chicago, in examining the different adaptive strategies black women have arrived at, suggests, "The strongest conception of womanhood that exists among all pre-adult females is that of the woman who has to take a strong role in the family. They [the pre-adult females] accepted the situation as part of life and tradition in the black community. It is against this backdrop that the symbol of the resourceful woman becomes an influential model in their lives."

As a result of her research, Afro-American sociologist Joyce Ladner sees three primary agents of socialization for the preadolescent black female: (1) the immediate and extended family; (2) the peer group; and (3) negative community influences such as exposure to rape, poverty, violence, and the like. The strong personality that results from exposure to the harshness of life enhances the girl's chances for survival and her adequate functioning within society. To "survive," the black woman must "make it" as a mother and a worker.

Consequently, over the years, education has been one of the black movement's priorities. The black woman's aspirations toward education are associated with an emphasis on career possibilities that are seen as making possible or easing the maintenance of the black family.

Despite the faith of black women in the education system as a means for social and economic advancement, equal education has not assured them equal access to opportunity. Black women with degrees equivalent to those held by men and white women have been unable to obtain equivalent jobs. The gap between the salaries of black men and women has widened. Both black and white women with some college education earn less than a black male who has only 8 years of education.

Although the black woman has made great strides in recent years in closing the educational gap, she still suffers from inadequate education and training. In 1974, approximately 75 percent of black women had completed high school compared with 85 percent of white women. Although there was a 56 percent increase in college enrollment of blacks between 1970 and 1974, only 16 percent of black women were enrolled in college at the end of that period. A college degree is attained by only 7.6 percent of black women.

Since 1970, little evidence exists of any advance in the relative earnings of black females. A look at the jobs in the top 5 percent of the earnings distribution shows that black females held none of them in 1960 and essentially none in 1973. Black women earn less than white women (a median income of $2,810), are employed in greater numbers (about 60 percent between the ages of 20 and 54), and hold a greater percentage of low-paying, low-status jobs (54 percent are employed as operatives or service workers). In 1975, 35 percent of black families were headed by women who earned a median income of only $4,465. That there is still a large number of black women in the labor force reflects to a considerable degree their continuing obligation to supply a substantial proportion of family income. It also suggests that educational attainments, no matter how small, raise participation rates more for black than for white women.

The quandary of black women is how best to distribute their energies among the multiple barriers of poverty, race, and sex, and what strategies to pursue to minimize conflicting interests and objectives.

More and more, young black women are starting to think about their futures as black women in the United States. They are not accepting societal interpretations of their roles. In the process of thinking things through they are being realistic about the roles that they will embrace. Black women will still have to work, but they want to work at jobs that are more challenging and that more fully use their strengths and talents. They want quality education and training to develop their abilities and interests. They want education that respects cultural differences and that educates for liberation and survival.

Puerto Rican Women

In immigrating to the States, Puerto Ricans differ in one main respect from most other minorities who preceded them: They come as American citizens. Nevertheless, numerous problems—differences in customs, racial inequalities, and a limited knowledge of English among them—have restricted their social, economic, and educational success.

Many Puerto Ricans report that the family, which is very important in traditional Puerto Rican culture, experiences a tremendous shock when it is transplanted from Puerto Rico to the mainland. No role in the Puerto Rican American family has been more challenged by immigration than that of the father. In traditional Puerto Rican culture the man is the undisputed head of the household. Meanwhile the "good woman" obeys her husband and stays at home, working long hours while caring for the children. But whether head of household or "good woman," the individual subordinates his or her wants and needs to those of the family.

On the U.S. mainland, where women have more prominence and stature, these traditional Puerto Rican roles are undercut. Puerto Rican women are not shielded from mainland differences. Economic need often projects them into the labor force where they are confronted by the greater expectation of women's roles. Then, too, the school and community teach Puerto Rican children that they should have more freedom, be more aggressive and independent, and should speak English rather than Spanish. These influences change the traditional roles within the family, causing strains, role conflicts, and identity confusion.

The Puerto Rican woman often drops out of school at an early age to enter the labor force (at the lowest level) in the hope that her wages will help her family out of a life of poverty. When she is able to find a job, she faces serious disadvantages, not least among them her lack of knowledge of English and the lack of bilingual programs in her community. Adequate training is another lack that keeps a decent salary out of reach, a situation that further compounds her housing, health, and other problems.

Of no assistance to her plight are discriminating hiring practices that have Puerto Rican women working for a lower wage than Puerto Rican men despite equal pay legislation. Many of the available opportunities have been so-called "women's jobs," which are economically and politically powerless and amount to nothing more than low-paid unskilled drudgery.

Supporting this glum picture of Puerto Rican women in America are the 1975 U.S. Census figures that show 1.7 million Puerto Ricans in the United States, 906,000 of them female, of whom only 154,000 have jobs. More than half of Puerto Rican women participating in the labor force are operative or service workers, and 68 percent of those working earned incomes below $5,000. The most recent data indicate that 31 percent of Puerto Rican households in the United States are headed by women who earn a median income of $3,889.

Puerto Rican women in America complete an average of 9.5 years of school. Only 25 percent of them attain a high-school education and a mere 3 percent are college graduates. Their educational attainments, like their employment, are hampered by their imperfect grasp of English and their identity confusion, which is often exacerbated by mainland prejudice and their own sense of being strangers in a foreign country. Of significant concern to Puerto Rican women is how much the lack of access to "mainstream" education influences their social and economic situations.

Puerto Rican women in the United States are still struggling with racial as well as sexual discrimination in housing, education, and hiring. They find the women's movement defined by Anglo-American standards and often oblivious to the special needs and strengths of minority women. They feel that the movement has tended to ignore and obscure the racist issue, resulting in double discrimination for minority women.

Puerto Rican women will not separate themselves from their cultural heritage or be alienated from their men. They strongly support the qualities of womanhood, strong family ties, and respect for the family as an institution. They will accept a movement that confronts sexism, but not one that divides the sexes. If the movement appeals to the issue of basic human rights, to the values inherent in the freedom of both sexes from sexism, and to the proposition that when a woman has freedom of choice this also frees the man—if this, in fact, is the meaning of the women's movement, then many Puerto Rican women will support it.

Mexican-American Women

Mexican-Americans constitute the second largest minority in the United States today, and more than 90 percent of them are city dwellers. Vilma Martinez, a young Chicana (feminine form of Chicano) lawyer, has speculated that "in 15 or 20 years the Hispanic population will surpass the black population. Our citizens must be awakened to the ramifications of this fact: Hispanos are a nationally significant, and not a regional, group."

Historically, the Chicano family has been patriarchal and authoritarian. Economic, social, and political leadership in Chicano communities traditionally has been male-based. Education, sexual liberties, and material comforts have been for the men, with the women taking a subordinate, supportive role within the family. The Chicana was controlled by her parents until she married and then had to be faithful to her husband and children.

Chicanos often place a greater emphasis on the family as a unit than on its individual members. Parents stress the use of Spanish as their children's primary language, insisting that to give up Spanish would be to say that one's ancestors accounted for nothing and that one's culture had made no impression on the history of the Southwest. The feeling prevails that the family nucleus would disintegrate if the children could not speak in Spanish to their grandparents.

Chicana leaders see three distinct choices open to Mexican-American women: The Chicana can adopt the traditional sex role, imitating the rural Mexican woman whose place is in the home; she can choose a dual role in which she is bilingual and begins to move away from traditional religious and family sex-role images; or she can cut her cultural ties and identify with the "liberated" middle-class white woman.

This diversity of role models for women within the Chicana community requires special consideration by education policymakers. Chicanas themselves express the need for having specific role models which they can follow at all education levels—elementary, secondary, community college, and higher education. And they're talking about teachers and administrators, not just Chicanas in school cafeterias. Many of them are looking beyond community-college training as secretaries or as cosmetologists.

Educational and vocational training opportunities must, therefore, be made more accessible and relevant to Chicanas' lives. The deficiencies in our educational system as it relates to Chicanas are underscored in that Chicanas complete an average of only 9 years of school. One-fourth of them have completed less than 5 years of school, 23 percent have completed high school, and only 2.2 percent of those 25 years of age and older are college graduates.

These low figures do not translate the zeal with which Chicanas seek education despite the many obstacles. One formidable barrier is hydra-headed discrimination because of race, color, national origin, language, and sex-role socialization. Then there are damaging or inadequate counseling, ill-prepared and unmotivated teachers, culturally biased achievement tests, inequality of school finances, tracking into non-college preparatory courses, economic deprivation, and a lack of role models.

Parents of Chicanas recognize the value of education as a tool for survival in a complex society. They encourage their daughters to pursue education, and there is a sense of family pride about a daughter's attendance at college. But parents also want Chicanas to remember their traditional family values and roles. Thus under pressure to succeed as both student and Chicana within a strange, impersonal, and often inflexible college environment, the young woman becomes vulnerable—and little wonder—to the despair and frustration that account for the high dropout rate of Mexican-American women.

Nor can the economic realities that often preclude interest in and access to educational attainment be overlooked. The annual income of Chicanas in 1974 demonstrates a cycle of poverty, with 76 percent of them earning less than $5,000. In terms of earning power as compared to all other Spanish-origin women, the Chicana is at the bottom, earning a median annual income of $2,682. It must also be noted that Chicanas are increasingly in the labor force because of economic need and responsibility as heads of households; 14 percent of Chicano families are supported by Chicanas, and one-half of these are below the poverty level.

Chicanas have tended to be suspicious of the woman's movement, which came about just as the minority movement was gaining momentum. Hostility toward white women who have moved into the forefront with their "sexual politics" results from the Chicanas' feeling that class interests have been obscured by the issue of sex which is easier to substantiate and to deal with than are the complexities of race.

Chicanas, along with many other minority women, question whether or not white women in power positions will perform any differently than their white male predecessors. Will white women work for humanity's benefit? Will they use their power to give entry skills and opportunities to minorities? Chicanas have seen little evidence of white women addressing these broader needs or exhibiting an understanding of the minority-wide issue of redistribution of income levels.

Bea Vasquez Robinson of the National Chicana Coalition succinctly states the minority women's position vis-a-vis the women's movement: "To expect a Chicana who has felt the degradation of racism to embrace a movement that is once more dominated by whites is childish." And in another instance, "We will join forces to the extent that you white women are willing to fight, not for token jobs or frills, but rather go to the roots of our common oppression and struggle for economic equality."

The Chicanas' prime concerns are economic survival and the continuance of their culture. Their issues are broader than sexism; theirs are racism and cultural pluralism as well.

American Indian Women

In any discussion of American Indian women, it is necessary to keep in mind the diversity among the 789 tribal entities existing today. Writing for the *HUD Challenge,* social scientist Regina Holyan says, "Some tribes allow and encourage prominent authoritative behavior on the part of their women, while other tribes such as the Navajo and Cherokee prefer that their women not act conspicuously in decisionmaking roles. These conflicting expectations by different tribes place Indian women in sensitive situations when they must interact with members of other tribes."

Nonetheless, like the Chicanas, American Indian women may choose among three separate subcultural roles: the traditionalist, stressing adherence to the tribal religion and cultural patterns; the moderate that retains elements of the traditional Indian heritage and customs while adjusting to the dominant white societal patterns; and the progressive, which replaces the traditional culture with the modern white beliefs and values. Educators need to be aware of these different role choices and to avoid influencing Indian students to choose a role based on the expectations of whites.

Among the cultural values basic to many tribes is an emphasis on living for today—in harmony with nature, with no time consciousness, with a concern for giving, not accumulating, a respect for age, and a desire for sharing and cooperating. These values are often in direct opposition to those stressed by the dominant culture's educational program. The white way of life is future oriented, time conscious, and competitive. It places great importance on youth, the conquest of nature, and long-term saving.

For over a century the Federal Government, largely through the Bureau of Indian Affairs, has assumed the responsibility for educating Native Americans to the standards of the general population. Because the Indians must live in the white man's world, their sense of survival tells them that education is the way to success, even though they may not agree with many of the practices of the schools their children attend.

Despite the availability of free schooling, only 6.2 percent of Indian females and 5.8 percent of Indian males in the Southwest have completed 8 years of school. Data from the 1970 Census, however, indicated that women in the total American Indian population complete a median of 10.5 years of school with just over a third (34.6 percent) graduating from high school. Although female Indians attain more years of formal education than do males, they have been shown to be dramatically less acculturated than Indian males.

Census data also show that only 50 percent of American Indian women report English as their mother tongue. This means that English is a second language for half of the Indian women. Educational policymakers—especially at the elementary level—must be aware of the high incidence of English language deficiencies among Indian females and plan programs accordingly.

There is a real need for American Indians to participate in fomulating education policy for reinforcement of the distinct tribal belief systems and value systems. Indians look upon self-determination as a necessity, especially in view of tribal diversity and the different learning styles that exist among the tribes. Yet Indian women often perceive Federal programs and the women's movement as sidestepping their particular wants and strengths and threatening family unit because these programs encourage them to seek their own self-satisfying goals. This is to say that though Indians will not dispute that education is necessary for survival, they dislike the specific methods because they disrupt their culture and often have the effect of channeling Indian women into domestic jobs and other low-paying positions.

Preservation of the family with the nurturing of children within the family structure is the prime goal of Indian-made policy. Should the Indians feel a Federal program to be in conflict with this policy, they can choose not to take part in it. That decision, however, is not without serious consequence: Not to participate can result in an effective block to progressive self-help by closing off economic and educational opportunities. Lack of education also prevents the American Indian from working from within the education and political systems where weighty issues must be dealt with: How, for instance, is access to educational funding on both Federal and State levels gained by Indian tribes individually? Who controls and uses the funding once it is gained? How can self-determination be enacted within existing guidelines for receiving educational funding?

Thus the Indian student has two life styles to learn. On the one hand, the ways of the white predominant culture must be learned as a survival skill, though Indian women caution against these ways being permitted to "vitiate" or influence tribal style. On the other hand, the Indian life content, which now is learned only through the home, must be learned simultaneously as standards and values. The Indian woman must be effective in both areas and aware of the appropriate responses expected of her in different situations.

Employment and job opportunities for Indian women are, naturally, affected by the level and quality of their educational background. More Indian women than any other group (86 percent) earn less than $5,000 per year. Thirty-five percent of Indian women participated in the labor force in 1970, and as a group they earned a median annual income of $1,697. Seventy percent were in the powerless and vulnerable position of clerks, operatives, and domestic service workers. Although there were two wage earners in almost half the Indian households in 1969, their median family income was a mere $3,300. American Indians, the smallest and poorest of all America's ethnic groups, "stand in a class by themselves when it comes to suffering economic deprivation," according to economist Lester Thurow.

For the most part, Indian women believe that working toward the improvement of the status of Indians as a people is where their efforts should be directed and not solely toward their status as Indian women. As a Winnebago woman put it, "We Indian women do not feel oppressed in the Indian world. We are more concerned with the problems of racial discrimination." An Isleta Pueblo woman observes that Indian women have a concept of equal rights that is different from that of the women's movement; they believe that acquiring equal rights does not necessarily mean that Indian women want to attain equal leverage in tribal matters. And Minerva White, a Seneca, recently said, "We have had women's liberation for 5,000 years; we have been liberated for 5,000 years, and so that is not an issue for us."

Because Indians do not make the same kinds of sex-role distinctions whites make, and because Indian women, especially those of matrilineal tribes, influence tribal economic decisions and are in decisionmaking positions, these women are not generally sympathetic to the women's movement. They accept the reality of social changes occurring, but ask little beyond a voice and some control over the directions of the changes that are profoundly affecting the lives within their tribe.

Asian-American Women

Asian-Americans, like American Indians, are a highly diversified ethnic group. The Asian-American population includes Koreans, Indians, Pakistani, Vietnamese, Indonesians, Thais, Malaysians, and a wide representation of Pacific peoples such as Samoans, Guamanians, and native Hawaiians. Americans of Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino origins are also included, and because more detailed research and description are available for them, they will, for the purpose of this discussion, represent all Asian-Americans.

Asians today constitute less than 1 percent of the population in the United States, although the importance of their presence in this country, past and present, far outweighs their numbers. From a background of "unskilled" labor and objects of discrimination, Asian-Americans have reached comparatively high levels of educational and occupational achievement. Chinese and Japanese, the most prominent of the Asian-descended groups in America, are often pointed out as the "successful" minority groups.

The first Census data of 1910 showed that 78 percent of the Japanese in this country were male, as were 89 percent of the Filipinos and 90 percent of the Chinese. Because recent immigration has almost consistently introduced more females than males into each of the Asian-American communities, the sex ratios have changed considerably. The Japanese and Korean populations are now predominantly female, partly a reflection of the number of war brides brought back by returning servicemen. The Chinese and Filipinos continue to be predominantly male.

A comparison of the labor-force status of women shows that a larger percentage of Asian-American women (50 percent) work outside the home than do black (48 percent) or white women (41 percent). A little over 55 percent of Filipino women and 42 percent of Korean women work; whereas Japanese and Chinese women occupy an intermediate position with 49 percent taking jobs, according to 1970 Census data. All in all the proportion of Asian-American females gainfully employed is higher than the national average, and this does not take into account the unpaid women in family-operated businesses, since many of these women do not classify themselves as "employed."

Although many Asian-American women are highly educated, having attended or completed college, they are nevertheless concentrated in the positions of bookkeepers, secretaries, typists, file clerks, and the like. "They are qualified for better jobs," says Betty Lee Sung of the Department of Asian Studies at City College of the City University of New York, "but are the victims of sexism more than racism."

Possible Strategies to Meet the Educational Needs and Strengths of Minority Women

Federal education agencies and foundations

- Conduct and encourage research into the problems and concerns shared by minority women in the area of education.
- Organize on national or regional levels a clearinghouse for information exchange on minority women and relevant resource personnel, materials, and programs.

State departments of education

- Interpret Title IX with a sensitivity to multiculturism, recognizing the double jeopardy of sex and race.
- Include multicultural female representatives in planning and developing programs for minority women and girls.
- Encourage and provide equal employment opportunities for hiring minority women in administrative and decisionmaking positions.
- Retrain educators, counselors, and administrators to sensitize them to the special needs and concerns of minority female students.
- Require teacher-training and certification programs to include intense self-evaluation sensitivity to multiculturism.

Local education agencies

- Include minority women and community members on the board of directors or trustees.
- Encourage minority women to prepare for career advancement and provide adequate training opportunities.

Education institutions (preschool through college)

- Recruit minority women into administrative, faculty, and student ranks.
- Provide special stipends and allowances for minority female students from low-income families.

- Adopt day-care, tutorial, and counseling services to enable minority women to partake of educational opportunities.
- Initiate special placement efforts for minority female graduates.
- Expand and enrich adult-education opportunities so that parents and children are exposed to acculturation at a more closely related pace.
- Encourage and preserve bilingualism.
- Emphasize in school and college curriculums the literature, music, art, dance, games, and sports of minority cultures.
- Make effective use of community resources and develop incentives for community participation.
- Evaluate regularly and systematically school programs that involve minorities.

Levels of unemployment of Japanese-American and Chinese-American women are generally low, even slightly lower than those for whites. In 1970, for example, the unemployment rate was only 3.7 percent for Chinese women. The problem is not in getting a job, but rather in the kind of job and the salary it pays. Many recent Chinese immigrants, fresh off the plane, can walk into one of the small garment factories scattered throughout any Chinatown or its peripheral area and start working the next day. They work by the piece and their hours are fairly flexible. Piece work at low rates is always available.

The presence of very young children has not limited the level of occupational achievement for young working Asian women. Chinese mothers show higher levels of occupational achievement than childless, never-married Chinese women. This is true also for Filipino women, although to a lesser extent than for the Chinese. This situation may represent a cultural carryover from the traditional Asian pattern in which middle-class Asian mothers are inclined to be employed. By Asian custom, older children help to take care of younger ones, thereby relieving mothers of these faimly duties during the day. Hence, the Asian "day-care" program is conducted within the home and family.

Chinese-American women are marrying later and limiting their families probably because they are spending more years in school. In 1970, the median years of schooling for each Asian-American group was slightly above the white attainment of 12.1 years. Today, differences in years of completed schooling among Asians and whites of both sexes have virtually disappeared.

Census data for 1970 indicate that 23 percent of Filipino and 58 percent of Chinese-American women between 18 and 24 years of age are in college. About three-fourths of all Japanese-Americans finish high school. Figures like these indicate that many families have shed the centuries-old belief that females are spoiled for wifehood and motherhood if they acquire some education. It is generally the foreign-born female who is the most deprived and, hence, the most handicapped. Her occupational sphere is, therefore, extremely circumscribed and limited to the most simple and menial jobs.

Many Americans are unaware that more Chinese-Americans are born abroad than are born in the United States. The foreign-born ratio will probably become greater as immigration exceeds native births. In essence, the Chinese-American population is largely a first-generation or immigrant-generation population. The tremendous adjustment that first-generation Chinese-Americans must make puts them at a disadvantage in every respect. They must re-educate themselves completely and quickly.

Most Americans assume that Asian-Americans have no social problems, an assumption which restricts the access of Asian-Americans to funds available to minority groups. As a result they have been forced to form self-help organizations in their own communities, an action leading to the misconception that Asians "take care of their own."

One segment of the Asian population most in need of help are those who cannot speak, read, or write English. Illiteracy is generally a problem with those over 45, especially the women. The younger generations are highly educated and bilingual, regardless of sex. However, in the 1970 Census, only 4 percent of the Chinese living in New York listed English as their mother tongue. In California, 12 percent and in Hawaii, 44 percent did so. That the Chinese have clung to their language more tenaciously than most other national groups is commendable and could provide a national resource of bilingual people.

Another problem Asian-Americans often encounter is the American cultural values that are in conflict with many traditional Asian values. For example, many Asian cultures have emphasized strict loyalty to the family, which trains children to avoid controversial, potentially embarrasing situations. Strict self-control and discipline were mandatory. As a result, Asians, especially women, often have appeared to be reserved, self-conscious, and reticent, finding continuity, permanence, and personal security in the close relations of the family. In contrast, dominant American culture now comprises a majority of single, nuclear families with few multigenerational living arrangements.

Another example would be American competitiveness based on "each for himself," a notion alien to most Asians. However, in the process of acculturation and upward mobility, many Asians have adopted the more expressive and assertive style of the dominant culture. Betty Lee Sung asserts that the tendency is becoming increasingly prevalent for Asian-Americans to believe that, in order to adjust to living in the United States, one must embrace the American way in toto and cast off the Asian heritage completely. She also believes that great psychological damage will result for these Asian-Americans. Instead, she holds, Asian-American women and men should strive for a culturally pluralistic society in which they can preserve their heritages while contributing to American social, civic, and educational life.

Like many foreign women, Asian-American women have been neatly categorized by stereotype milled in white imaginations. Asian women are often described as being docile, submissive, and sexless. Or they may be exotic, sexy, and diabolical. They are often presented as objects or commodities rather than as persons with ideas, aspirations, talents, and feelings.

A situation familiar to many Asian women comes as a consequence of recent immigration. Since the end of World War II, more than 500,000 women of foreign nationality have entered the United States as spouses of Americans. Over one-third of these women were from Asian countries. Professor Bok-Lim Kim of the University of Illinois has found that many of these women experience a host of adjustment problems. Reports of severe physical abuse and deprivation are not uncommon. In one study made at Washington State Professor Kim noted that divorce or separation among Asian wives of military men resulted in over 20 percent of those in the study becoming female heads of households. (This figure is in contrast to the 6 percent of Chinese-American and 8 percent of Filipino-American female heads of households.) These Asian wives are often unable to seek help because of their isolation, lack of proficiency in English, unfamiliarity with the life-style, and fear of outside contacts.

Young Asian-American women, especially those who are third generation, are feeling a void and are expressing a need and desire to rediscover their ethnicity. These women are more liberated and more assertive. They are challenging the monocultural ideal of the majority society to acknowledge, analyze, and incorporate Asian-American women and men at all social, political, educational, and economical levels. Fundamental changes in the American educational process toward a goal of cultural pluralism is a realistic response to their peculiar needs and strengths.

Minority women by and large are concerned with how Anglo society—its educational institutions in particular—has attempted to divorce them from their cultural heritage and alienate them from their men. They want to share the belief that the only route to fulfillment of the American Dream is by perseverance and education. Yet the present educational system often militates against such goals for minorities and especially females.

Many minority women are high-school dropouts. Consequently they look to secondary-school programs to be made more relevant and available to them. In like vein higher education, a recent alternative for many minority women, needs to be demystified. College role models in their immediate families are still rarely found because most minority women in college today are the first in their families to be there. Setting this kind of precedent puts pressure on the young women, brought on by expectations from both their families and themselves. Those who make it through 4 years of college soon become painfully aware that the job benefits which should follow are often limited. Many college-educated minority women are unable to get white-collar jobs at a professional level.

The fact is that minority women frequently explain their problems in economic terms. The kinds of jobs open to them is a smarting issue to these women. Of 36 million women in the labor force, 4.7 million are minorities, constituting more than

40 percent of all minority workers. Discriminatory hiring practices based on racist and sexist factors still prevail and are just further complicated when minority women have educational attainments, the more educated often finding themselves underemployed and underpaid. It is often the case that both white and minority women with some college education earn less than minority men with less than a high-school education.

Generally, however, the more education a woman has the more likely she is to be in the skilled or professional labor force. New job opportunities in expanding occupations and additional schooling are almost certain to place more minority women in the labor force.

Statistics indicate that most minority women workers are high-school graduates. March 1974, figures showed 61 percent had graduated from high school, including 10 percent who had completed 4 or more years of college. The comparable figures for white women were 75 and 14 percent, respectively. Because minority women complete a median 12.3 years of schooling, the educational system must plan and implement instruction that will meet their special needs during these 12 years.

One purpose of the educational system is to equip all learners with satisfying and rewarding competencies for entering the world of work in the field of one's choice. The curriculum and instruction used in preparing the professionals who will work with minority girls and women must reflect the heritage, needs, and concerns of the various minorities. Cultural pluralism, a relatively new idea in education, addresses the cultural differences of minority women and informs majority men and women about this diversity. This pluralistic concept is the hope that ethnic women have in getting others to understand, promote, and respect differences in cultural patterns and learning styles that are so widespread in America—and, not incidentally, in advancing themselves in the dominant culture. ●

CHANGING MALE ROLES

by James Harrison

Every new social movement inevitably churns up a measure of apprehension and uncertainty, and the struggle for equal rights between the sexes is no exception. Initially there is no agreement about the social consequences of full equality of opportunity for women and men. Nor are men clear about what exactly is in it for them were they to respond positively to the changing sex roles revolution.

Some questions seeking answers: Will women's gain be men's loss? What will be the consequences for children? Will men have to give up options for certain jobs? If yes, what will they do instead? Do men have it "so good" now that changes most likely will be detrimental to them? Will the division of labor and traditional role expectations in families have to change?

These are all realistic and difficult questions. They are made more difficult, however, because contemporary society provides no models of what an egalitarian world would be like. In the absence of such models, the opponents of social change often create caricatures of the goals of both men and women who seek greater equality. Their distortions cannot prevail, however, and as inevitable as change itself is an increasing understanding of the destructive consequences of traditional sex-role socialization for both men and women, which makes it abundantly clear that change is needed and desirable. Nevertheless, social change, whether intentionally sought or unintentionally brought about through stresses induced by economic,

---

Mr. Harrison is a psychologist at the Bronx Psychiatric Institute. The following also contributed to the paper on which this article is based: Robert Brannon, professor of psychology, Brooklyn College; Marc Figen Fasteau, attorney, New York City; Robert Fein, psychologist, McLean Hospital Harvard University; Jack Nichols, free-lance writer, New York; Joseph Pleck, psychologist, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan; and Robert Townsend, professor of English, Amherst College.

political, and technological conditions, is often accompanied by feelings of uncertainty and anxiety. This is especially so when the changes involve aspects of men's and women's definition of themselves, their expected roles, and the ways they relate to one another and the world at large.

The presence of fear or anger among men about the changes that are taking place hardly needs documentation. Many men are confused. Some are defensive. Others are disdainful and condescending. Many individuals may have to make adjustments in their role expectations, especially if these expectations stand in the way of the rights and prerogatives of others. And the notion that women's gain need not be men's loss requires an assessment of "gain" and "loss" in terms of the total range of human values, and not exclusively in economic or political terms. Women need not lose the special protection they have had; instead, men can be extended similar protection against exploitation. No one need be required to give up an individually chosen lifestyle. Couples or families should generally be able to retain their role patterns or division of labor if these patterns are mutually acceptable to all family members, although exceptions are conceivable as, say, in the case of preferential hiring. Together men and women can share the political and economic responsibility for a society that will affirm as its goal the creation of conditions under which maximum human development for all citizens is possible.

Creative change, however, is inhibited by the inertia of the status quo, as well as by active forces that inhibit innovative development. Nevertheless many men and women now are articulating exciting visions for the future and are working toward giving them reality. Before describing some of their ideas and some of the problems they face, it is critical that the social context that makes them so difficult to achieve be examined.

Women's-rights advocates and their critics agree that Western culture is "patriarchal," that is, characterized by male domination over women. As a framework for analysis, four separate but interrelated dimensions of the social reality in which patriarchy is expressed and by which it is perpetuated—institutions, ideology, language, and academic scholarship—need to be examined and clarified insofar as they serve to inhibit social change and reinforce the impact traditional culture has upon men who are beginning to work toward a more egalitarian society.

Institutional Sexism

One of the important insights of the civil rights movement is the recognition that racism is not simply personal, but that it is sustained and perpetuated by social structures. The same applies to sexism. Just as the racist phenomenon was labeled "institutional racism," so too may the social structures of a patriarchy be labeled "institutional sexism." Every major institution in our society is currently dominated by men: government, law, education, health care, defense, entertainment, religion, industry, or any other sphere of activity. Areas dominated by women, such as primary teaching or nursing, exist only within the context of male-dominated institutions. This domination constitutes objective discrimination, most flagrantly against women, more subtly against men. It results in a lack of guarantees of individual rights to women. It makes access to male-controlled professions more difficult for women. But it also stigmatizes men who wish to work in areas traditionally considered within "women's sphere"—child care and nursing, for example. To understand what sustains institutional sexism, other dimensions of the patriarchal society must be considered.

Sex-Role Ideology

Traditional sex-role ideology has divided the vast range of human possibility into two mutually exclusive spheres: Psychological characteristics and social roles that are appropriate for men represent "masculine strivings" in women; those that are appropriate for women are stigmatizing for men. Ideology, however, does not simply provide explanations and justifications for social structure. As unconsciously inculcated values or as taken-for-granted beliefs, ideology also affects our thought processes and our behavior.

Two illustrations of sex-role ideology in action may be useful. A young father was seen bouncing a child on his shoulders as he walked to his car. Both were happily laughing and talking when suddenly the father froze and was overheard to say, "Oh, I forgot—you're a girl." He put her down gently on the sidewalk, and when she began to cry, he looked dismayed, probably thinking: "How like a girl to cry." The father brought pain to his child and to himself because he is a victim of sex-role ideology.

A second illustration concerns a vignette: While driving, a man and his son were in an accident and the son, badly hurt, was rushed to the hospital. As he was wheeled into the emergency room the surgeon took one look at him and recoiled saying, "I can't operate on him. He's my son!" This straightforward, descriptive story turns into a conundrum for most readers and makes evident to what extent sex-role ideology has a profound and pervasive effect on our thought processes. The surgeon was the boy's mother, of course.

Sexist Language

It is well known that the English language lacks certain words to refer exclusively to both men and women. Masculine words and pronouns are used generically to refer to both men and women simultaneously. In the sentence, "A good student always does his homework," the masculine pronoun is used even though the reference includes girls. And many persons insist that "Peace on earth, good will toward men" is understood universally to be inclusive and that to ask for linguistic reform is tantamount to attacking the beauty of our historic linguistic traditions. Others say that half of our fellow humans should not be excluded by insisting on "the brotherhood of man."

Who is right? The contents of the Constitution and its first 10 Amendments make no explicit references to men and women, male or female. The terms "people," "person," or "citizen" along with the appropriate masculine pronouns are used. Did the authors and early interpreters assume that these terms were used in the generic sense to include both males and females? Certainly women inhabitants of the new country were expected to obey the laws of the Federal Government and the several States. On the other hand, the notion that women would vote or hold office was so far from possibility in the 18th century that it was not even felt necessary to address it. In practice it was simply assumed that active participation in government was an exclusive male prerogative.

Consider the subtlety with which language mediates sex-role ideology. The father's phrase, "Oh I forgot, you're a girl," is not an innocent declarative statement. It conveys exclusion from the world of men's prerogative, and as such it communicates a lesser valuation of the women's role and a concomitant loss of self-esteem. Reciprocally, in order to maintain self-esteem, boys must carefully avoid any epithet which is associated with the world of women.

Sexism in Academic Scholarship

"Know thyself. Presume not God to scan; The proper study of mankind is man." In his appeal for humanistic scholarship in the 18th century, perhaps Alexander Pope intended his generic language to include women. Nonetheless, the study of man has in large measure been the study of males. Feminist scholars have documented that the study of literature and the arts have often neglected or underestimated the contributions of women. Similarly, historical scholarship has been shown most frequently to be an account of the acts of men. To discover the presence of such bias in the social sciences—the very disciplines that seek objective understanding about human beings, their cultures, and their social organizations—is of even greater surprise.

In sum, patriarchal society is expressed objectively through institutions, justified subjectively by ideology, transmitted through language, and perpetuated by academic scholarship. In spite of all this, seeds of transformation have been present that have enabled some persons to envision alternative possibilities.

The Emergence of a Men's Movement

Current sex-role issues are characterized by two complementary and sometimes overlapping emphases: social change and personal growth. It was recognized that the acceptance of the taken-for-granted world by many women prevented the possibility of social change. As a means for assisting women to develop a greater understanding of the meaning of their own experience, the consciousness-raising (CR) group evolved. CR groups may prove to be one of the important social inventions of this century. Small groups of women gathered to discuss dimensions of their lives—parents, schools, dating, work, husbands, children, and the like. The process of sharing enabled many women to recognize that the forces that had shaped their lives had often been arbitrary, and that their dissatisfaction with the restrictions of their roles was shared by other women. These groups often become communities of support, which enabled individual women to break out of the confinements of traditional roles. Now men, too, are developing CR groups.

Men recognized their own need for the sort of close community that developed in CR groups and wished to have this experience for themselves. Several groups of men began to meet during the later 1960s. As the numbers of men sympathetic to the women's movement and aware of the need of examination of men's roles have grown, broader bases of communication and action have emerged. Individual CR groups have planned local conferences, which have in turn spawned new CR groups. Larger, more loosely connected groups of men have founded men's resource centers. Several periodicals about men's issues are now published, and books offering systematic analysis of men's roles have begun to appear.

Men's CR groups vary in size, duration, focus, and value for the participants. There are nevertheless common themes which characterize them. One is the attempt to understand the individual, unique, and highly personal events and experiences which led to each member's socialization as an adult male. Most men's groups give close attention to tendencies of individual men to dominate, to monopolize time, to avoid emotion, and to compete with each other. Usually the group will call attention to any individual who falls into such traditional male-role patterns. Individual men's stories, however, are heard without judgment or censure. Other members may respond or react, but no individual or group opinion is presumed to be normative for other members.

One particularly successful group, which has met for 4 years with high continuity of membership, has adopted several other guidelines. Each member of the group rotates in alphabetical order as the convener. The job of the convener is to stop the informal conversation and get the group started; to warn the group a quarter of an hour before stopping time; and to stop the group at the agreed upon time. The convener may also propose a particular plan or strategy for getting into a topic. The group rotates on an irregular basis from home to home in order to see how other men live and so each may serve as host. Group members contract to meet for a specified number of weeks—usually 10 to 12—in the fall and spring. During the contract period, members are expected to consider weekly attendance among their highest priorities; absences are assumed to be due to illness or emergency. Dropouts from the group are not welcome to drop back in. At the conclusion of the contract period, the group assesses its membership, decides whether to invite new members and agrees when to begin the next contract period. The limited time commitment enables the members to make a high level of commitment for the specified period. This group holds a weekend retreat for members.

Groups, of course, can be disappointing. They may not develop continuity or the needed level of trust. Often such problems can be avoided by careful planning on the part of a few members, or the careful working out of a group consensus or procedure.

However, most men who have been in CR groups are enthusiastic. It is not unusual to hear a man say that his CR group was one of the most important experiences in his life. For the first time many men break out of a sense of isolation and recognize that they have "brothers" who are dissatisfied with the rigidities of the male role. Many men report that for the first time they have developed the sort of friendships with other men in which they can discuss real personal concerns. Some men have reported that CR groups were the first occasion in which they actually enjoyed being with other men. Over and over, the contrast between typical male gatherings and CR groups is described. Instead of the familiar attempt to top the last story, men hear each other, and honestly try to describe their own struggles.

Human beings' need for approval and affirmation has often locked men into role conformity out of fear that expression of individuality would bring ridicule and stigmatization. CR groups have given many men a new source of support, one that has encouraged self-expression and the deepening of understanding of personal relationships with both men and women.

Men's Resource Centers and What They Do

In the last few years men's centers have developed in most big cities and many university towns. In contrast to CR groups, which focus on growth in personal awareness and continuity of group identity, men's centers are more activitist in orientation and serve as a base for a variety of divergent programs. Typically, a local center will have a weekly or monthly meeting to discuss business and policy matters. Most attempt to minimize organization and to emphasize decisionmaking by consensus. Task-oriented committees may be formed and a treasurer selected, though a men's center rarely has a traditional set of officers. Meetings are often facilitated by rotating leadership. Organizational structures which are identified with traditional patriarchal culture are generally avoided.

Men's centers sponsor events that tend to correct the imbalance of traditional sex roles. For example, some hold bake sales for charity, pot luck suppers prepared for and by the men, and provide child care for feminists' meetings. Others hold workshops to re-educate men in adult living skills. Most men's centers have counseling groups for men in crisis.

Recently, a Men's Awareness Network (MAN) has been formed to serve as a national communication channel among men, and between men's centers. Local centers will publish a national newsletter on a rotating basis, including theoretical articles, personal stories, reviews and notices of relevant books, and announcements of meetings and conferences.

What Men Are Learning

Most men have basically good feelings about their parents, some fond memories about their schools, and are on the whole satisfied with their accomplishments. Many men are aware that parents and teachers worked hard to help them get where they are. The sense of gratitude they experience, however, often inhibits critical scrutiny of their early experiences of growing up. They look back and take for granted that things were as they had to be because their parents and teachers took these things for granted.

From analysis of the women's movement and closer examination of personal experience, some men are becoming convinced that growing up did not have to be as difficult as it was. They are taking a hard look at the world around them, and are making some critical observations. These observations are not judgmental; no one is being blamed. Rather, these criticisms are based on a recognition of a destructive and erroneous assumption at the heart of the socialization process in our culture: that the traditional male role is the norm for organizational life, and that boys have to be bent, shaped, cut down to size, or stretched out to fit it. The results of this view is that the child starts with a deficit. He is not a man. He is taught that he must become a man. Becoming a man has turned into an accomplishment, an achievement.

The problem does not lie in the expectation that children should be encouraged and taught to meet certain standards. No one doubts that it is good to encourage children to be strong, or honest, or responsible, or fair. Rather, the problem lies in the elusive and contradictory elements that fuse to form the conception of the male role. The message that is repeatedly communicated to boys is "You must be a man." But boys often do not grasp the intended message, only hearing that they are not men and that to achieve self-esteem and respect from others they must be something that they are not—whatever it is. Some will grasp the impossibility of the situation early in their development and stop trying to conform. Others will develop distorted perspectives in their attempt to achieve the elusive goal. The form these distortions take in the contemporary male can be made evident in the context of a description of the male role. To formulate a clear description is difficult, however, for the same reasons that it is illusive for children. It contains contradictory elements, and its expectations are transmitted differently to individual men, depending on the variations in experience within their families, schools, or cultural groups.

In spite of these variations in context, nuance, and style, some common themes can be discerned. Author Robert Brannon has abstracted four core elements of the male role which seem to be present regardless of individual variations in the way they are expressed. First, the clearly understood rule is "No sissy stuff." The problem in attempting to live up to this standard is that it constitutes a negative definition of manhood, rooted in the secondary status of women in our culture. Those emotions, thoughts, or interests of an individual male child that have been labeled "women's stuff" have to be hidden or repressed.

The second element is the struggle for status, to be "The Big Wheel." The problem is not the emphasis on accomplishment, but rather the emphasis on external validation and competition with others. To achieve success a boy has to be the biggest or the strongest; men have to be the most powerful, the most competent, the richest.

The third element is the image of the "Sturdy Oak." Men learn that they must always cope, can never admit defeat, and must never express emotions of hurt, sadness, and grief. No quivers are permitted in the "stiff upper lip." To do so is to "lose your cool," and by implication the status of being a man.

So far the prescription is: be the best, no failures, and no women stuff—three impossible standards. The fourth element provides a way out if a man should experience some inner doubts: "Give 'em hell." This aspect of the male role sometimes is expressed in violence toward women and other men, sometimes in loud and ostentatious braggadocio, sometimes in the subtle intellectual putdown. It may be symbolized in images of male roughness: swagger, smoking, and drinking to create an image, motorcycles and cars used as weapons, intentional roughness in sports, all boiling down to the assertion, always with a competitive and sometimes with a sadistic flavor, "I can dominate."

Taken together, these elements leave boys and men with limited alternatives. Many boys don't know how to meld these elements together or with other publicly affirmed values like fairness, sensitivity, helpfulness, gentleness.

Many contemporary men are rejecting the tyranny of the male role, but this is not for boys and adolescent men who continue to model themselves on what they hold to be the best images of adults as they see and understand them. Adolescents have no alternatives until adults provide alternative models. These models must be made on a different conception of the possibilities for men. A first step is a rejection of the sex-role ideology that sustains traditional sex-role expectations. The polarization of human characteristics into two separate spheres marked "masculine" and "feminine" is a fiction. At worst this has produced men who are brittle, rigid, and violent; at best, men with damaged self-esteem and hampered creativity.

Men in School

Most men remember school as the time when they did not have to carry a load of responsibilities. When they look deeper and attempt to remember the details of growing up, however, they recognize that not everything was fun. The unpleasant memories are not about the work that was required, but about the feelings that were generated by the competitive mold in which most school activities were cast.

Take sports for example. As boys, some men were clumsy, uncoordinated, and generally inept physically. Their problem may have been due to visual or physical handicaps, lack of experience, rural isolation from other playmates, or an absent father. They may have dreamed of learning to throw or catch a ball well or how to bat. But what happened? They recall that the two best athletes in the class would be selected as team captains, the other boys being chosen, one by one, according to their skill. The embarrassment of being among the last chosen was increased by the usual sneers or groans from the captains forced to pick from among the remaining "undesirable" players. If the game was football, the "unwanted" tried to be invisible and stay out of the way; if the game was baseball, they tried to get into right field where they hoped the inactivity would afford them the best chance of escaping the role of the "goat."

Sometimes a well-intentioned teacher would recognize a boy's deficiencies and attempt to help, in front of other children, again exposing him to ridicule. Thus boys who most needed physical education devised elaborate schemes to avoid it whenever possible. It never seemed to occur to most teachers that these children had performance anxiety and needed to have the experience of success. No one took them aside in privacy to teach them how to catch and throw a ball so they could overcome their fear of trying; no one thought to devise other games or sports by which these children could gain a better sense of self-esteem.

Other men recall that they were good at sports, but were never made to feel that they were good enough. They look back now with curious wonder at the emphasis placed on competition and winning. Supposedly, the theory was "teamwork," the theme, "It doesn't matter whether you win or lose, it's how you play the game," but most men do not remember being taught much about teamwork. They remember the emphasis on winning and the entreaties of the cheerleaders to "Hit 'em again, harder, harder." They now wonder why most of the resources of the school were spent on team sports in which only a minority could participate while the rest, as it turned out, were taught to be spectators. With a different allocation of resources they might have learned a lot more about individual and partners sports, which could be of some use to them now that they are 40, overweight, and flabby. In short, what most men remember about physical education is that if they had the skills, they enjoyed playing; if they didn't, they were humiliated and learned nothing.

A good many men also remember the same sort of experience in the classroom, where, again, there was too much emphasis on competition. Some were failures in both places; others who were humiliated on the playground served as the agents of humiliation in the classroom—but were oblivious to it there.

Looking back, men may ask why they could not have been taught to help one another, why teachers were not more sensitive to the fact that children can learn only in secure situations. Teachers did not intend to humiliate children, but they often assumed that recognition of inadequacies would spur the child to achieve. Many men recall being frozen in anxiety when asked to solve an equation or conjugate a verb. Failure left them with the feeling they could accomplish nothing. Few were assured that it was no disgrace to make an error; most report that, in retrospect, they learned less, both physically and academically, than they could have if they had not been made so anxious by the constant pressure to compete.

Men also remember that there were some things they should not know. To have anything to do with "feminine" subjects would endanger a boy's tenuous claim on the "masculine" label. Of course, school did not teach this prejudice. It came along with earliest socialization, with language, with unconsciously inculcated values, with observations about who really does the "important" work in the grown-up world. But school did little to counteract the stereotypes, and so there was little or no opportunity for boys to learn about such things as nutrition, shopping, cooking, clothing, and child care— a gross oversight in view of the number of men who don't marry or who are divorced or widowers.

Spelling out the implications of these observations is a complex task that will require cooperation and collaboration among men and between men and women. Those who have thought carefully about their experience agree that there is need for serious educational reform that would recognize all knowledge as appropriate subject matter for all human beings and would permit and encourage the expression of a vast range of individual variation among all students, both men and women.

Men Are Teachers

A hundred years ago the school was part of the male world. Today the majority of administrators and principals—the positions of traditional power and prestige—are still men. However, a majority of high-school teachers are women, as are an even larger proportion of elementary-school teachers.

Several years ago the greater learning difficulties of some boys were attributed to the relative absence of men in the classroom, and the suggestion that more men be "feminized," for teacher roles implied that men who taught were "effeminate."

Recent advocacy for more male elementary teachers has emphasized that teaching small children does not "feminize" men, and that elementary teachers are indeed "real men." This emphasis may be a delayed reaction to the previous unfortunate conceptualization, or perhaps a protest against the pervasive sexism in the culture. Nonetheless, it would be an unfortunate consequence if male elementary-school teachers had to develop "compensatory masculinity" to survive in a field that is currently staffed predominantly by women. Sexism cannot transform sexism; male teachers trying to prove their "masculinity" could be even more destructive than unbalanced staffing patterns. The valid reasons for men to be in elementary teaching is their wish to be there, their capacity to do the job, and their ability to model equality in a still sexist society.

Fathers Are Parents, Too

It was once thought that only mothers could care for infant children. This was considered "natural" and usually attributed to the difference in hormonal balance between men and women. Such an obvious "fact" hardly required research. Recent studies suggest that the salient factor in arousing in parents protective and caring feeling for their child is the dependency of the child and not the hormones of the adult, posing the question whether most men have not lived their lives with "infantile" deprivation because a patriarchal society has assumed that they are incompetent to care for babies. Slowly the recognition is growing that men are not incapable of being fully competent parents, but that sex-role ideology has prevented them from realizing these possibilities—to everyone's detriment.

Fathers are still discouraged from taking responsibility for children in some families. The continuing sex-role ideology makes it difficult for them to gain custody of their children in divorce cases. Courts and their investigative officers often assume that men are unable to carry out parental responsibilities, and mothers are stigmatized if they are willing to give up custody. To gain custody in some States, fathers have to prove that their former mate is an "unfit mother," a requirement hardly in the interest of the child.

The Future for the Men's Movement

While women's consciousness and men's awareness are having some impact upon all cultural groups, there are important disagreements among social-change advocates as to strategies, priorities, and timing of efforts for social change. The critical issue will be whether the advocates of human liberation can coordinate their struggles without subordination or domination.

Within the emergent men's movements, these differences also surface. Some men are most interested in focusing upon their own personal growth and change. Others observe that men's freedom from socially imposed roles is contingent upon women's freedom and for that reason urge political support for women as the priority. Or they urge that the focus be the patriarchal social structures that not only enable men to dominate women, but other men as well. Still others stress sexist, racist, and class oppression that makes some men and women dominators of others. For some men the "movement" is understood to be precisely the place where such questions must be faced and clarified. Others argue that the men's movements must adopt a correct analysis of the structures of oppression at the outset in order to avoid replicating the oppressive character prevalent in other institutions.

Clearly then, the issues of ideology, organization, and structure are important open questions for the men's movement. The questions that have been foremost in the minds of movement activists have been: How can hierarchies, bureaucracies, entrenched leadership, "in-groups"—all bearing the marks of patriarchal society—be avoided? How can the necessary information be disseminated and communication facilitated without replicating elitist patterns? How can men who are beginning to recognize something amiss in traditional role expectations be helped to develop their own analysis and awareness of the problem? How can the many skills of individuals be used without developing new oligarchies? Can there be division of labor without difference in status?

None of the movements for social change has accomplished its goals without problems, reversals, and strategic errors. Perhaps more than any other movement, a men's movement needs this crucial insight: that people—men included—have the right to make errors!

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1978 O - 248-199